

IDENTIFICATION OF  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m SOURCES USING COLOR-DECONFUSION

X.W. SHU<sup>1,2</sup>, D. ELBAZ<sup>1</sup>, N. BOURNE<sup>5</sup>, C. SCHREIBER<sup>1</sup>, T. WANG<sup>1,10</sup>, J. S. DUNLOP<sup>5</sup>, A. FONTANA<sup>3</sup>, R. LEITON<sup>6</sup>, M. PANNELLA<sup>1,7</sup>, K. OKUMURA<sup>1</sup>, M. J. MICHAŁOWSKI<sup>5</sup>, P. SANTINI<sup>3</sup>, E. MERLIN<sup>3</sup>, F. BUITRAGO<sup>5</sup>, V. A. BRUCE<sup>5</sup>, R. AMORIN<sup>3</sup>, M. CASTELLANO<sup>3</sup>, S. DERRIERE<sup>8</sup>, A. COMASTRI<sup>9</sup>, N. CAPPELLUTI<sup>9</sup>, J. X. WANG<sup>11</sup>, H. C. FERGUSON<sup>4</sup>,

## ABSTRACT

We present a new method to search for candidate  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m sources in the GOODS-North field, using a  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  “color deconfusion” technique. Potential high- $z$  sources are selected against low-redshift ones from their large 500 $\mu$ m to 24 $\mu$ m flux density ratios. By effectively reducing the contribution from low-redshift populations to the observed 500 $\mu$ m emission, we are able to identify counterparts to high- $z$  500 $\mu$ m sources whose 24 $\mu$ m fluxes are relatively faint. The recovery of known  $z \gtrsim 4$  starbursts confirms the efficiency of this approach in selecting high- $z$  *Herschel* sources. The resulting sample consists of 34 dusty star-forming galaxies at  $z \gtrsim 2$ . The inferred infrared luminosities are in the range  $1.5 \times 10^{12} - 1.8 \times 10^{13} L_{\odot}$ , corresponding to dust-obscured star formation rates (SFRs) of  $\sim 260 - 3100 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  for a Salpeter initial mass function. Comparison with previous SCUBA 850 $\mu$ m-selected galaxy samples shows that our method is more efficient at selecting high- $z$  dusty galaxies, with a median redshift of  $z = 3.07 \pm 0.83$  and 10 of the sources at  $z \gtrsim 4$ . We find that at a fixed luminosity, the dust temperature is  $\sim 5\text{K}$  cooler than that expected from the  $T_d - L_{\text{IR}}$  relation at  $z \lesssim 1$ , though different temperature selection effects should be taken into account. The radio-detected subsample (excluding three strong AGN) follows the far-infrared/radio correlation at lower redshifts, and no evolution with redshift is observed out to  $z \sim 5$ , suggesting that the far-infrared emission is star formation dominated. The contribution of the high- $z$  *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m sources to the cosmic SFR density is comparable to that of (sub)millimeter galaxy populations at  $z \sim 2.5$  and at least 40% of the extinction-corrected UV samples at  $z \sim 4$ . Further investigation into the nature of these high- $z$  dusty galaxies will be crucial for our understanding of the star formation histories and the buildup of stellar mass at the earliest cosmic epochs.

*Subject headings:* galaxies: high-redshift galaxies: starburst infrared: galaxies submillimeter: galaxies

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Ultraluminous infrared galaxies (ULIRGs; with rest-frame 8-1000 $\mu$ m luminosities in excess of  $10^{12} L_{\odot}$ ) are among the brightest far-infrared (far-IR) emitters in the Universe (Sanders & Mirabel 1996; Casey, Narayanan & Cooray 2014 and references therein). The far-IR luminosities of ULIRGs are dominated by reprocessed thermal dust emission due to star-formation activity, corresponding to a star formation

rate (SFR) of  $>170 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . Locally, these luminous, dusty star-forming galaxies are rare, but they become more abundant with increasing redshift and dominate the IR luminosity density of galaxies around  $z \sim 2$  (Lagache et al. 2005; Chapman et al. 2005; Le Floc’h et al. 2009; Magnelli et al. 2009, 2013). The formation process of ULIRGs is currently in dispute. While mergers are believed to be a dominant process in local ULIRGs, studies have suggested that the driver of star formation in ULIRGs at high redshift ( $z \gtrsim 2$ ) appears different (e.g., Dekel et al. 2009), with a significant fraction being pure disks (e.g., Kartaltepe et al. 2012; Targett et al. 2013). Reproducing the number counts and extreme far-IR luminosities for this population, especially those at the highest redshifts, can place tight constraints on galaxy formation models (Baugh et al. 2005; Swinbank et al. 2008; Coppin et al. 2009). Since a significant fraction of cosmic star formation is likely hidden by dust (e.g., Lagache et al. 2005; Chapman et al. 2005; Casey et al. 2012a, 2012b, 2014; Barger et al. 2012; Lutz et al. 2014; Madau & Dickinson 2014), understanding high- $z$  far-IR luminous galaxies is crucial in order to construct a complete picture of galaxy evolution.

Observations at submillimeter (submm) and millimeter (mm) wavelengths have identified a population of ULIRGs at high redshift (e.g., Borys et al. 2003; Pope et al. 2005; Perera et al. 2008; Michałowski et al. 2010a,b; Yun et al. 2012; Wardlow et al. 2011; Roseboom et al. 2013; Casey et al. 2013), which benefits from a strong negative  $K$ -correction in the (sub)mm. Follow-up stud-

<sup>1</sup> Laboratoire AIM-Paris-Saclay, CEA/DSM/Irfu - CNRS - Université Paris Diderot, CEA-Saclay, pt courrier 131, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France, xinwen.shu@cea.fr

<sup>2</sup> Department of Physics, Anhui Normal University, Wuhu, Anhui, 241000, China

<sup>3</sup> INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, Via Frascati 33, I - 00040 Monte Porzio Catone (RM), Italy

<sup>4</sup> Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

<sup>5</sup> SUPA, Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Royal Observatory, Edinburgh, EH9 3HJ, U.K.

<sup>6</sup> Astronomy Department, Universidad de Concepción, Casilla 160-C, Concepción, Chile

<sup>7</sup> Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Department of Physics, Scheinerstr. 1, 81679 München, Germany

<sup>8</sup> Observatoire astronomique de Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, UMR 7550, 11 rue de l’Université, F-67000 Strasbourg, France

<sup>9</sup> INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Bologna, Via Ranzani 1, I - 40127, Bologna, Italy

<sup>10</sup> School of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, 210093, China

<sup>11</sup> Department of Astronomy, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

ies of submm-selected galaxies (SMGs) have shown that the bulk of SMGs is between  $z \sim 2-3$  (e.g., Chapman et al. 2005), with less than  $\sim 30\%$  being at  $z > 3$  (Chapin et al. 2009; Biggs et al. 2011; Wardlow et al. 2011; Michałowski et al. 2012). While radio identification has been the common technique to precisely localize SMGs at other wavelengths for follow-up observations, a significant number of them remain undetected even in the current deepest radio observations (e.g., Swinbank et al. 2014; Barger et al. 2014), indicating that they are possibly at higher redshifts. Interferometric submm imaging of SMGs has been used to unambiguously identify counterparts in the optical/near-IR in a relatively unbiased way, revealing a significant population of SMGs at  $z \gtrsim 3$  (e.g., Younger et al. 2007, 2009; Smolčić et al. 2012a, 2012b, 2015; Miettinen et al. 2015), challenging the previously derived redshift distribution of SMGs (see also Vieira et al. 2013). On the other hand, the selection of SMGs is known to be severely biased against galaxies with warmer dust temperatures (e.g., Chapman et al. 2003; Casey et al. 2009; Magdis et al. 2010; Chapman et al. 2010; Magnelli et al. 2010). Therefore, the properties of the whole high- $z$  ULIRG population, such as the redshift distribution, luminosity and number density, are still not well characterized.

The *Herschel Space Observatory* (hereafter *Herschel*) carried out observations in the far-IR bands up to  $500\mu\text{m}$  and mapped much larger sky areas down to the confusion limit than previous (sub)mm surveys. By sampling the peak of heated dust emission for the first time, *Herschel* enables a direct assessment of the far-IR spectral energy distribution (SED) of SMGs (e.g., Magnelli et al. 2010, 2012, 2014; Huang et al. 2014; Swinbank et al. 2014). It has provided unbiased measurements of obscured SFR, dust temperature and dust mass for a large number of star-forming galaxies up to  $z \sim 2$  (e.g., Elbaz et al. 2010, 2011; Oliver et al. 2012; and references therein).

It has also been shown that *Herschel* is efficient at detecting galaxies at very high redshift when a well-characterized selection is used (e.g., Pope & Chary 2010). For instance, Riechers et al. (2013) pre-selected sources with red SPIRE colors (i.e.,  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{350\mu\text{m}}$  vs.  $S_{350\mu\text{m}}/S_{250\mu\text{m}}$ ), yielding a sample of potential  $z > 4$  sources, including one at  $z = 6.34$ , the most distant known ULIRG to date. Nevertheless, the requirement of  $S_{500\mu\text{m}} > S_{350\mu\text{m}} > S_{250\mu\text{m}}$  means that such selection is biased against some  $z > 4$  dusty star-forming galaxies with warm dust temperatures (Daddi et al. 2009b; Capak et al. 2011; Smolčić et al. 2015), and limited to the brightest  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources ( $\gtrsim 30$  mJy, Dowell et al. 2014). Therefore, a more conservative and efficient way to select high- $z$  ULIRGs is required to better understand the properties of this important population of dust obscured galaxies in the early Universe.

A challenge in studying the properties of high- $z$  *Herschel* sources has been the low resolution of the data, especially in the SPIRE passbands (full width at half maximum, FWHM,  $\sim 18''$ ,  $25''$  and  $36''$  at 250, 350 and  $500\mu\text{m}$ , respectively). Source confusion is a severe issue in the *Herschel* data, which makes it difficult to identify the correct counterparts and measure fluxes for individual *Herschel* sources. The most common technique to




FIG. 1.—  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  flux ratio as a function of redshift for the GOODS-Herschel (Elbaz et al. 2011) galaxies with “clean”  $500\mu\text{m}$  measurements (grey dots). Solid black line: main-sequence SED from Magdis et al. (2012). Dashed black line: mean trend of the Chary & Elbaz (2001) SEDs that are parameterized by the total IR luminosity. Shaded region: range of  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios for CE01 templates, with orange dot-dashed line representing the SED of the minimum IR luminosity ( $\log(L_{\text{IR}}/L_{\odot})=8.3$ ) and blue dot-dashed line for the maximum IR luminosity ( $\log(L_{\text{IR}}/L_{\odot})=13.6$ ). Black dotted line shows the SED from the local starburst galaxy M82 that is out of the range of CE01 libraries at  $z \lesssim 3.2$ .

deconvolve the *Herschel* sources is the use of *Spitzer*-MIPS  $24\mu\text{m}$  data of better resolution ( $\sim 5.7''$ ) as the position priors to fit their fluxes (e.g., Magnelli et al. 2009, 2013; Roseboom et al. 2010; Elbaz et al. 2011; Leiton et al. 2015). This de-blending approach assumes that all *Herschel* sources are detectable in the deep  $24\mu\text{m}$  images, and thus introduces a bias against  $24\mu\text{m}$ -faint galaxies which fall below the detection limit. Moreover, the extraction of  $24\mu\text{m}$  catalogs usually requires IRAC source positions as priors, which can introduce additional identification biases. Magdis et al. (2011) have demonstrated that in the Great Observatories Origins Deep Survey (GOODS) fields, about 2% of the PACS sources are missed in the MIPS- $24\mu\text{m}$  catalog, most of which being at  $z \sim 1.3$  and  $z \sim 0.4$  with strong silicate absorption features. There has been no systematic study to address this issue for SPIRE sources, though simulations suggest that statistically very few sources would be missed when requiring a  $24\mu\text{m}$  prior (Leiton et al. 2015).

Further problems arise when priors are too close for the *Herschel* flux to be deconvolved: when two  $24\mu\text{m}$  priors are closer than the FWHM/3 of any given *Herschel* band, the flux is usually attributed to one or the other. Previous studies have systematically favored the brightest of the two  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts (e.g., Magnelli et al. 2009, 2013). While such a choice is generally justified for sources at low redshift, it can mis-identify the counterpart of a very distant source which is faint at  $24\mu\text{m}$  but much brighter at *Herschel* wavelengths, especially in the SPIRE  $500\mu\text{m}$  band. For the same *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux, a  $z = 3.5$  galaxy can be a factor of  $\sim 40$  fainter in the  $24\mu\text{m}$  band than a galaxy at  $z = 0.8$  (e.g. Leiton et al. 2015). Indeed, the recent study of Yan et al. (2014) has




FIG. 2.— *Upper panel:* Multiwavelength image cutouts of a high- $z$  source, GN10 (Daddi et al. 2009a), in our sample. Each cutout is  $30''$  on a side. The white square denotes the position of the  $8\mu\text{m}$  ( $24\mu\text{m}$ ) source and the black circle indicates the beam FWHM ( $36''$ ) at  $500\mu\text{m}$ . In the ratio map it is evident that there is an excess emission centred on GN10, which is detected with greater significance in the ratio map than in the  $500\mu\text{m}$  map. *Middle panel:* zoomed-out view of the  $500\mu\text{m}$  and ratio image, with a size of  $1.8 \times 1.8$  arcmin $^2$ . On the left, we also show the “beam-smoothed”  $24\mu\text{m}$  image (Section 2.2) for comparison. Red cross marks the position for a  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.44$  galaxy close to GN10 ( $\sim 5$  arcsec separation), for which the SPIRE  $350\mu\text{m}$  and  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux is associated in the official *Herschel* catalog (Elbaz et al. 2011). *Lower panel:*  $24\mu\text{m}$  and the *Herschel* photometry (red stars) for the  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.44$  galaxy. Red dotted curve shows the best-fitting SED at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.4$ . Black curve is the best-fitting SED to the far-IR photometry at the redshift of GN10 ( $z_{\text{spec}} = 4.04$ ). The SED fittings suggest that GN10 (instead of the nearby source) dominates the far-IR emission at  $350\mu\text{m}$  and  $500\mu\text{m}$ . Details of the counterpart identifications to the *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources detected in the ratio map will be presented in Section 2.3.

shown that the brightest  $24\mu\text{m}$  source does not necessarily contribute predominately to the far-IR emission seen in the SPIRE bands. It is therefore important to investigate in detail the mis-associated and/or missed population of luminous, high- $z$  *Herschel* sources which could play a significant role in the star formation history in the early Universe (Casey et al. 2012b, 2014; Barger et al. 2012; Dowell et al. 2014).

In this paper, we have undertaken a systematic search for high- $z$  *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources in the GOODS-*North* field, which has the deepest SPIRE observations currently available, using a map-based “color deconvolution”

technique. We show that our method, by constructing a  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio map, can effectively extract high- $z$  sources contributing to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission. The resulting sample consists of 36 galaxies identified at  $z \sim 2-4.6$ . In Section 2 we present the data and our method; in Sections 3 & 4 we present and discuss the derived properties of the galaxies, and we summarize the results in Section 5. Throughout this paper, we adopt  $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ,  $\Omega_M = 0.3$ ,  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ , and we use a Salpeter initial-mass function (IMF).

## 2. DATA AND METHOD



### 2.1. Data

The data used in this paper come from the *Herschel* observations of GOODS-North field as a part of the GOODS-*Herschel* program. The observations cover a total area of  $10' \times 17'$  down to depths of 1.1, 2.7, 5.7, 7.2 and 9 mJy ( $3\sigma$ ) at 100, 160, 250, 350 and  $500\mu\text{m}$ , respectively. The SPIRE images of GOODS-North are the deepest observations undertaken by *Herschel* to date, while the PACS data are slightly shallower than the central region of GOODS-South obtained in GOODS-*Herschel* that was combined with the PEP survey in Magnelli et al. (2013). A detailed description of the observations is given in Elbaz et al. (2011). We take advantage of these deep *Herschel* observations, along with the deep Spitzer/MIPS  $24\mu\text{m}$  observation of the GOODS-North field (PI: M. Dickinson), to identify the best candidates of distant dusty star-forming galaxies seen by *Herschel*. Other ancillary data are used including *Spitzer*/IRAC at 3.6, 4.5, 5.8 and  $8\mu\text{m}$ , VLA at 1.4 GHz ( $5\sigma \sim 20\mu\text{Jy}$ , Morrison et al. 2010), SCUBA at  $850\mu\text{m}$  ( $3.5\sigma$  catalog, Pope et al. 2006; Wall et al. 2008), SCUBA-2 at  $850\mu\text{m}$  ( $4\sigma$  catalog, Barger et al. 2014), and AzTEC at 1.1mm ( $3.8\sigma$  catalog, Perera et al. 2008; Chapin et al. 2009).

Photometric redshifts used in this paper are drawn from a  $K_s$ -band selected multi-wavelength catalog in the GOODS-North field, spanning 20 photometric bands from *GALEX* NUV to IRAC  $8\mu\text{m}$ . We refer the reader to Pannella et al. (2015) for a more detailed description of the multi-wavelength data, catalog production and photometric redshift estimation. This catalog contains 14828 galaxies,  $\sim 81\%$  of which are brighter than the  $5\sigma$  limiting magnitude of  $K_s = 24.5$ , and 3775 galaxies having spectroscopic redshifts. By comparing to the spectroscopic subsample, Pannella et al. found that the relative accuracy  $[\Delta z = (z_{\text{phot}} - z_{\text{spec}})/(1 + z_{\text{spec}})]$  of photometric redshifts reaches  $\sim 3\%$ , with less than  $3\%$  catastrophic outliers (e.g., objects with  $\Delta z > 0.2$ ). Based on the multi-wavelength photometric catalog, stellar masses were determined with *FAST* for each of  $K_s$ -detected sources (see Pannella et al. 2015 for more details).

### 2.2. Construction of the $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ ratio map

In this section, we present our method to identify candidate high- $z$  dusty galaxies. The observed far-IR/ $24\mu\text{m}$  colours of individual galaxies are known to be correlated with redshift (Leiton et al. 2015). The trend is strongest for the  $500\mu\text{m}/24\mu\text{m}$  colour. In Figure 1, we show the evolution of the  $500\mu\text{m}/24\mu\text{m}$  ratio as a function of redshift for the main-sequence SED from Magdis et al. (2012) (solid black line) and the mean trend of Chary & Elbaz (2001; CE01) templates (dashed black line). While the SEDs for galaxies at  $z > 4$  are poorly constrained, distant galaxies are characterized by large  $500\mu\text{m}/24\mu\text{m}$  ratios (e.g.,  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}} > 30$  at  $z > 2$ ). These SEDs are globally in agreement with the observed  $500\mu\text{m}/24\mu\text{m}$  colour distribution of the “clean” sources in the GOODS-North field (grey dots)<sup>12</sup>. We note that there exists a population of low-luminosity galaxies below  $z \sim 2$  with relatively high  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios, causing the large scatter of the distribution. They might

be cold galaxies with abnormal low dust temperature of 10-20 K ( $\sim 25$  per degree<sup>2</sup>, e.g., Rowan-Robinson et al. 2010). However, given the very small area covered by GOODS-North, we estimated that the number of such galaxies is low ( $\sim 2$ ) in the field. Some silicate-break galaxies at  $z \sim 0.5$  and  $z \sim 1.5$  may contribute the elevated  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios due to the shift of the silicate absorption features into the MIPS/ $24\mu\text{m}$  band at these redshifts, but their fraction is relatively small (less than 10%, Magdis et al. 2011). Alternatively, the large scatter could be partly attributed to the catastrophic photometric redshift outliers, or chance associations of a high- $z$   $500\mu\text{m}$  galaxy with a lower redshift  $24\mu\text{m}$  prior. These require further investigations.

Therefore, with the assumption that redshift dominates over temperature evolution in producing the observed shift of the IR SEDs, we are able to select distant galaxies against the low-redshift ones based on their large  $500\mu\text{m}$  to  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux ratios. We choose this color over the shorter SPIRE wavelengths because the  $500\mu\text{m}$  band probes the peak of far-IR emission up to the highest redshifts. However, due to the source blending issues, it is difficult to unambiguously assign a measured  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux density to a specific object seen in higher resolution images. A single  $500\mu\text{m}$  source is usually made of multiple  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts that are not necessarily associated. Simulations have shown that  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux densities can be systematically overestimated due to source blending (Leiton et al. 2015). Therefore, we do not simply search for targets using pre-existing  $500\mu\text{m}$  photometric catalogs where flux measurements might be highly uncertain, but use a map-based technique keeping the information of the flux distribution in the *observed* images.

Our search approach consists of building a  $500\mu\text{m}/24\mu\text{m}$  ratio map, which relies on the deep *Spitzer*/MIPS  $24\mu\text{m}$  data. For the GOODS-North field of interest here, the  $24\mu\text{m}$  data reach fainter far-IR luminosities than the *Herschel* bands up to redshift  $z \sim 3$  (see Figure 4 in Elbaz et al. 2011). To build our  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio map, we use the real SPIRE  $500\mu\text{m}$  map that we divide by an image containing all  $24\mu\text{m}$  detections down to  $21\mu\text{Jy}$  (at a level of  $3\sigma$ , totally 2704 galaxies), which are distributed at their actual positions. We do not use the real *Spitzer*-MIPS  $24\mu\text{m}$  image because we found that even after smearing the image to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  beam, negative pixels due to noise fluctuations introduced fake sources in the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio map. In brief, we added point sources using the  $500\mu\text{m}$  point spread function (PSF) at the positions  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources under identical astrometric projection as the  $500\mu\text{m}$  map, scaling each PSF to the  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux, to build an image that matches the actual  $500\mu\text{m}$  map in beam size and pixel scale. The astrometric accuracy of the  $500\mu\text{m}$  map is verified by stacking at the positions of 241  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources with  $S_{250\mu\text{m}}$  in the range 10-35 mJy in the field. The stacked map has an offset from the center of the  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts of  $\sim 0.8$  arcsec, which is small compared to the 7.2 arcsec pixel size of the  $500\mu\text{m}$  map. In order to take into account the astrometry uncertainties of the *Herschel* data, a random astrometric error of  $\sim 0.5''$  was introduced to the source positions. Note that in this beam-smeared image,  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux density for each source is kept, and the background is dominated by the smeared faint sources

<sup>12</sup> Clean galaxies are defined as sources with  $\leq 1$  neighbour of  $S_{\text{neighbour}} > 0.5 S_{\text{central}}$  within a distance of  $20''$  (e.g., Elbaz et al. 2011), for which blending effects are small.




FIG. 3.— The  $P(D)$  plot for the  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  ratio map. The vertical dot-dashed lines correspond  $1\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$  of the dispersion. The red curve represents the  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  ratio after removing all individually detected  $500\mu m$  sources in the *Herschel* catalog used in Elbaz et al. (2011). This illustrates that the false detections caused by map artifacts that would pass our selection threshold are negligible (see Section 2.5).

populating the whole image.

We then construct a  $500\mu m/24\mu m$  ratio map by dividing the actual  $500\mu m$  image by the beam-smeared  $24\mu m$  map. Since low- $z$  galaxies are expected to have much lower  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  ratios compared to high- $z$  ones (Figure 1), this procedure thus effectively reduces the contribution to the map from the bulk of the low-redshift galaxy population, while considerably boosting the signal from candidate distant sources.

In Figure 2, we show an example of a spectroscopically confirmed  $z = 4.05$  SMG (GN10, Daddi et al. 2009a) identified in the  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  ratio map (see Section 2.3.1), whose  $500\mu m$  flux was initially wrongly associated to a nearby source at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.44$  due to the strong source blending. It can be seen from Figure 2 that GN10 is faint at  $24\mu m$ , and its SPIRE emission particularly at  $500\mu m$  is heavily blended with nearby sources, making it difficult to identify directly. In contrast, the galaxy is unambiguously uncovered in the  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  ratio map at a position coincident with its  $24\mu m$  counterpart. Note that the measured SPIRE  $350\mu m$  and  $500\mu m$  flux in the public catalog (Elbaz et al. 2011) is associated with the nearby  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.44$  galaxy. However, as shown in Figure 2 (lower panel), SED fittings using the whole library of CE01 SED templates to the  $24\mu m$  to far-IR photometry suggest that this source contributes to  $< 20\%$  of the measured  $500\mu m$  flux. The use of the starburst SED derived by Magdis et al. (2012) didn’t improve the fittings and yielded similar results, strongly suggesting that the source is likely wrong associated as the counterpart. Conversely, the best-fitting SED model at the redshift of GN10 yields a much better result ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 31.9$ ), indicating it should dominate the measured  $500\mu m$  emission. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our method for uncovering and selecting high- $z$   $500\mu m$  sources. The selection efficiency of our method will be investigated in detail on simulated data (Section 2.3.1) and a validation of the method using SCUBA2 data is presented in Section 2.3.3.

### 2.3. Object identification in the $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$ map

Given that the  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  ratio is very sensitive to high- $z$  sources, we then perform a systematic search for candidates on the ratio map using SExtractor (Bertin & Arnouts 1996). Since the noise distribution is highly non-Gaussian in the final ratio map, it is difficult to define a minimum signal-to-noise (S/N) requirement for source extraction. We therefore used simulations to determine the minimum S/N threshold in order to optimize the “purity” and completeness of the resulting sample. Based on such simulations (see Section 2.3.1), we adopted a minimum S/N of 2, corresponding to a minimum  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  ratio of 20.4, where the noise fluctuation, or defined as “effective” noise, was estimated from the dispersion of pixel distribution in the ratio map,  $P(D)$  plot, as shown in Figure 3 (black curve). Note that this S/N requirement based on simulations cannot be translated to a nominal flux detection limit in a trivial way, but it is sufficient for our purpose of identifying candidate high- $z$  galaxies. A more detailed description on the simulations and the detection efficiency will be given in the next section.

#### 2.3.1. Selection efficiency

For our sample to be robust and meaningful, we need to determine the efficiency of our selection of  $z \gtrsim 2$  infrared-luminous galaxies. To do this we perform Monte-Carlo (MC) simulations by injecting fake sources into the actual maps. The positions of injected sources are randomly distributed but are chosen to avoid overlapping within known sources detected in the ratio map (Section 2.3). In the simulations, we assumed a mean  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  color evolution with redshift, as shown by the dashed curve in Figure 1. The evolutionary trend is derived by averaging the  $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$  color over a suite of CE01 templates for a given redshift bin. As we will describe later, we used mainly the CE01 library to fit the mid-to-far-IR photometry and derive the integrated far-IR luminosities. The CE01 library comprises a total of 105 SEDs with a range of dust temperatures and is widely used to characterize the far-IR properties of ULIRGs (e.g. Magnelli et al. 2012; Swinbank et al. 2014). The simulation samples a  $S_{500\mu m}$  range from 5 mJy to 30 mJy in nine steps and a redshift range  $1.5 < z < 5$  in six steps. We estimated the efficiency of detection at a given flux and redshift as the fraction of the injected sources that were recovered in the ratio map, using the same selection procedure as above<sup>13</sup>.

We carried out  $N_{\text{sim}}=200$  independent simulations for each of the flux densities, each of which has  $N_{\text{src}}=20$  sources injected.  $N_{\text{src}}$  was chosen to be small enough to avoid overlapping between the simulated sources. The averaged detection efficiency over the  $N_{\text{sim}}$  simulations forms the final detection efficiency, which is displayed as a function of redshift and  $S_{500\mu m}$  in Figure 4. This figure shows that, as expected, the recovery efficiency increases at high flux densities and redshifts. For instance, for a  $S_{500\mu m}=15$  mJy (typical  $3\sigma$  confusion limit, Nguyen et al. 2010) source at redshift  $z = 2$ , the selection efficiency is  $\sim 45\%$ , while it increases to  $\gtrsim 80\%$  for  $z > 3$  galaxies with the same flux. Above  $z = 3$ , the curves of

<sup>13</sup> Sources are considered recovered if they are found within 2 pixels of the injected position with a peak S/N above  $2\sigma$ .




FIG. 4.— *Upper left*: Selection efficiency as a function of  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux density and redshift, assuming a mean CE01 SED (Chary & Elbaz 2001). Note that using the main-sequence SED from Magdis et al. (2012) in simulations yields similar results. For sources with  $z > 3$ , the selection functions appear very similar and the recovery rate is  $\gtrsim 60\%$  above 10 mJy. *Upper right*: Selection efficiency as a function of source density for simulated galaxies at  $z = 3$ . The source density is defined as the number of  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within  $20''$  radius. *Lower left*: Number of expected false detections above a given detection threshold. *Lower right*: The detection rate of contamination sources at  $z < 2$  as a function of  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux for different redshift bins.

the detection rate as a function of flux evolve very similarly, suggesting that our method is effective at selecting high redshift sources with a completeness of  $\gtrsim 50\%$  for a  $S_{500\mu\text{m}} \gtrsim 10$  mJy source. Note that the detection efficiency for each real source depends on the intrinsic SED, as well as the possible presence of source blending.

Due to the contamination of bright nearby sources, which is particularly strong in the SPIRE  $500\mu\text{m}$  band, the selection could introduce a bias against the areas where the projected number density of  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources is higher. Our random distribution of sources in the real  $500\mu\text{m}$  map allows for checking the effect of the “local” confusion noise on source detections. We find that the recovery rate decreases with the increase of projected  $24\mu\text{m}$  source density ( $N_{\text{neib}}$ )<sup>14</sup>. As shown in Figure 4 (right), for a galaxy at  $z = 3$  with  $S_{500\mu\text{m}} = 10$  mJy, the probability that the source with  $N_{\text{neib}} \lesssim 2$  is detected in the ratio map is  $\sim 60\%$ , while it decreases to less than 40% in regions where there are more than six  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within a radius of  $20''$ . Correcting for such bias, the detection efficiency would be higher.

<sup>14</sup> For a given galaxy of interest, the source density,  $N_{\text{neib}}$ , is defined as the number of  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within a  $20''$  radius.

Visual inspection of source spatial distribution suggests that sources appear to be found in areas where the projected  $24\mu\text{m}$  source density is relatively low. Note that sources which are significantly fainter than their close neighbours in the SPIRE/ $500\mu\text{m}$  would not pass our S/N selection. There are (rare)  $z \gtrsim 4$  ULIRGs detected at submm and/or mm that are too faint to be detected in the SPIRE data, such as the one at  $z = 5.2$  (HDF850.1, Walter et al. 2012). Such sources would not be selected by our method and hence would be missing from our sample. In addition, our minimum S/N requirement in detecting sources in the ratio map discriminates against galaxies with M82-like SED unless they are at  $z > 3$  (Figure 1).

### 2.3.2. Counterpart Identification

We describe in this Section the procedure used to attribute shorter-wavelength counterparts to the *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources detected in the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio map. It is important to note that the use of this ratio map constructed from a list of  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources does not preclude the identification of  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources with no  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts. Such sources will naturally emerge as objects with a high ratio. In the following, we show



how probabilities of association are determined for potential  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts. We also define a quantitative threshold below which no  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart is considered reliable, hence identifying  $24\mu\text{m}$  dropouts. Once a source was detected in the ratio map, we searched for potential counterparts in the higher-resolution  $24\mu\text{m}$  image out to a radius of 15 arcsec from the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  centroid. The search radius was determined from our simulations (Section 2.3.1), where we found that for more than 90 per cent of sources, the extracted positions are less than 15 arcsec from the input positions, i.e., the probability of missing potential counterparts is less than 10 per cent<sup>15</sup>. Note that at the extreme depth reached by the  $24\mu\text{m}$  imaging reported here, the cumulative surface density of  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources yields 1-8 sources per search area with a median of 3 sources. For larger radii, one will find more counterparts but the probability of chance associations will also increase.

The primary method for identifying the most likely counterparts to each  $500\mu\text{m}$  source is ‘ $P$ -statistics’ (Downes et al. 1986), by calculating the Poissonian probability of sources in a high-resolution catalog ( $24\mu\text{m}$  and/or radio) that lie within the search radius,  $\theta$ . Given a potential counterpart with flux density  $S$  in the high-resolution imaging, the probability of finding at least one object within  $\theta$  of at least that flux density is  $P = 1 - \exp(-\pi n_{(>S)} \theta^2)$ , where  $n_{(>S)}$  is the surface density of sources above flux density  $S$ .  $P$  gives the likelihood that a  $500\mu\text{m}$  source is associated with a counterpart in a higher-resolution map by chance. The lower the  $P$ -value, the less likely it is that the candidate is associated with a  $500\mu\text{m}$  source by chance, and the higher the probability of a genuine match. However, as has been pointed out in the literature (e.g., Yun et al. 2012), the often adopted high-resolution  $24\mu\text{m}$  or radio continuum data for the counterpart identification may suffer from a systematic bias against high- $z$  sources. Since the main goal of the ratio map is to favor higher- $z$  sources which have statistically higher  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios, we replace the surface density of  $n_{(>S)}$  in the computation of  $P$ -value by  $n_{(>z, >S)}$  to take into account the redshift information. For a given counterpart,  $n_{(>z, >S)}$  is the surface density of objects brighter than  $S$  which have redshifts above  $z$ . This means that in a catalog that is cut at flux density  $S$  for a given counterpart, we considered only those with redshifts above  $z$  in calculating the probability of it being a chance association.

Unlike what happens at shorter wavelengths, the best counterpart for a  $500\mu\text{m}$  detection is not the brightest  $24\mu\text{m}$  prior but instead results from a combination of source luminosity and redshift. To account for this, For a given potential  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart, we do not use the number density of sources above flux  $S$  at the  $24\mu\text{m}$  in calculating the Poissonian probability of chance associations, but of  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts brighter than a “predicted”  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux density,  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}^{\text{pred}}$ . This is obviously only possible in a field such as GOODS-North with a high redshift completeness. To estimate  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}^{\text{pred}}$  for each  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart and then determine a density criterion based on it, we assume a characteristic  $500/24\mu\text{m}$  flux

<sup>15</sup> This search radius also represents a  $2\sigma$  positional uncertainty, with  $\sigma \sim 0.6 \times \text{FWHM}/(S/N)$  (Ivison et al. 2007), where FWHM = 36 arcsec, for a detection in the  $500\mu\text{m}$  map with  $S/N=3$ .




FIG. 5.— *Upper:*  $P$ -values calculated as  $P = 1 - \exp(-\pi n \theta^2)$ , where  $n$  is  $n(>S_{500\mu\text{m}}^{\text{pred}}, >z)$  and  $\theta$  is the search radius of  $15''$ , are plotted against redshifts for all  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius (filled squares). Candidate counterparts identified with  $P \lesssim 0.1$  are shown in red circles. For sources with multiple candidate counterparts (11/42), the one with the least  $P$ -value is plotted. The  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}^{\text{pred}}$  is predicted  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux for each source (see Section 2.3.2). *Lower:* The distribution of  $S_{500\mu\text{m}} / \text{total}(S_{500\mu\text{m}})$ , where  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}$  is the  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux density of the counterpart identified with  $P \lesssim 0.1$ , and  $\text{total}(S_{500\mu\text{m}})$  is the summed  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux of all *input*  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius. Here we used the *input*  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}$  of each source in the simulated map. Note that 36 out of 42 sources have one  $24\mu\text{m}$  galaxy contributing more than 50% of the total  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux (a majority contribution to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission), suggesting a high efficiency of the  $P$ -value in identifying the *best* counterpart. For the remaining six objects with  $S_{500\mu\text{m}} / \text{total}(S_{500\mu\text{m}}) < 0.5$ , five have multiple counterparts ( $P$ -values between 0.0027 and 0.0864). The summed  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux density of those counterparts to the  $\text{total}(S_{500\mu\text{m}})$  is greater than 0.5. The red dashed vertical line represents  $S_{500\mu\text{m}} / \text{total}(S_{500\mu\text{m}}) = 0.5$ .

density ratio that depends on redshift following the trend shown with a dashed line in Figure 1. Such a redshift dependence of the  $500/24\mu\text{m}$  color represents the evolutionary trend of mean  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio of CE01 SEDs. Since high-redshift  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources are expected to present a larger  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio and hence a higher probability of being detected in the ratio map, this procedure will naturally select the corresponding  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources as potential counterparts and reduce the probability of chance associations with lower-redshift sources. However, one has to treat this statistic with caution, as we assumed that lower- $z$  galaxies with abnormal IR SEDs that would have similarly high  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios are




FIG. 6.— Cumulative distribution of  $P$ -values for all  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts within the search radius. The solid lines shows the distribution of the modified  $P$ -values when taking into account the redshift information. Also shown is the distribution of  $P$ -values which were calculated using only the  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux, as often adopted in literature (dotted line), and those using only the predicted  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux (dashed line).

rare (e.g., Rowan-Robinson et al. 2010). We will comment on later in this paper,  $\sim 17$  per cent of identifications might be due to the contaminations from some of the lower- $z$  populations. Note that using the observed  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux to predict  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux is an alternative way to identify counterparts, but maybe problematic (regardless of the uncertainty in choosing IR SEDs), since without a perfect knowledge of priors, the precise measurements of the  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux are impossible due to the effect of blending, resulting in the predictions of  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux with high uncertainty.

In order to define a threshold for our modified  $P$ -value calculated for the  $24\mu\text{m}$  catalog,  $P_{24\mu\text{m}}^C$ , that will correspond to a realistic association probability, we use the realistic mock *Herschel* data that are described in detail in Schreiber et al. (2015). We construct a  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map for the mock *Herschel* data and detect candidate high- $z$  sources using the same procedure as we described above. In Figure 5 (upper), we plot the  $P$ -statistics calculated using the formulation above, against the redshifts for all input  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius (filled squares). We found that at a threshold of  $P \lesssim 0.1$ ,  $\sim 90\%$  sources detected in the ratio map would have at least one  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart at  $z \gtrsim 2$  (red circles), and no source below  $z \sim 1.5$  has a  $P$ -value greater than 0.1. Figure 5 (lower) shows the distribution of the ratio of  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux of candidate counterparts ( $P \lesssim 0.1$ ) to the total  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux of all  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius. This ratio provides a measure of the importance, in terms of  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux, of the identifications. A ratio close to 1 indicates that the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission is dominated by a single (high- $z$ )  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart. Only  $\sim 14\%$  (6/42)  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources detected in the ratio map have more than one  $24\mu\text{m}$  galaxy with additional source(s) contributing up to 50% of the total  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux, and five of them in fact have multiple  $z \gtrsim 2$  counterparts. Therefore  $\sim 86\%$  (36/42) of the  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources have been associated with a single  $z \gtrsim 2$  source, which is main contribution to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission ( $>50\%$ ), suggesting a high efficiency of the identifications.

In Figure 6, we plot the cumulative distribution of our modified  $P$ -values when taking into account the redshift information for all  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts within the search radius (solid line). Also shown is the distribution of the traditional  $P$ -values which were calculated using only the  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux, as often adopted in literature (dotted line). Based on the resulted Poisson probabilities, almost none of the associations would be judged to be significant at  $\geq 90\%$  confidence (i.e.,  $P \leq 0.1$ ). Using the predicted  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux instead (dashed line) would result in slightly more sources with  $P \leq 0.1$ , but still not statistically high enough to quantify the formal significance of the identifications.

### 2.3.3. Validation of the method with SCUBA2

In order to further test our method and its efficiency in uncovering candidates of high- $z$  *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources, we build a  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map using the data from the COSMOS field for which we have a SCUBA-2  $450\mu\text{m}$  image for direct comparison. The higher resolution of SCUBA-2 ( $7.5''$  FWHM, Geach et al. 2013) at  $450\mu\text{m}$ , compared to  $36''$  at  $500\mu\text{m}$ , offers a unique opportunity to assess the reliability of the high- $z$   $500\mu\text{m}$  sources identified using our  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  method. Figure 7 shows the SCUBA-2  $450\mu\text{m}$  image of the COSMOS field (left). The corresponding *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  image of similar size is shown in the middle. On the right, we show the *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  to *Spitzer*  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux ratio map, overlaid with detected sources (red circles) using the same search criteria as described in Section 2.1. It can be seen that many bright  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources in the actual map (middle) disappear in the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map. This is likely due to the fact that many of them are dominated by low- $z$  galaxies where the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios are low. Conversely, while some sources appear relatively faint and undetectable in the actual  $500\mu\text{m}$  map (close to the confusion limit  $\sim 6\text{mJy}$ ), they are more unambiguously seen in the ratio map (e.g., the last two panels in Figure 9). These fainter  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources are in fact clearly seen in the deeper SCUBA-2  $450\mu\text{m}$  imaging ( $\text{rms} \sim 2.5\text{--}4.0\text{ mJy/beam}$ ) of COSMOS.

When compared to the field covered by the SCUBA-2  $450\mu\text{m}$  map, a total of 22 sources are detected in the ratio map, and 18 of them have  $450\mu\text{m}$  counterparts within  $15''$ . For the remaining four sources without SCUBA-2 counterparts, three are located close to the edge of the SCUBA-2 map where the local noise level is relatively high (white circles in Figure 7). We also checked the positional offsets between the sources identified in the ratio map and the SCUBA-2  $450\mu\text{m}$  sources. We found that the positional offsets for most sources are less than  $10''$ . Considering the SCUBA-2 beam size of  $\sim 7''$  which is close to the pixel size of *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  map ( $7.2''$ ), this strongly suggests a physical association between the sources detected in the ratio map and those in the SCUBA-2 map.

With the same  $P$ -statistics and cut ( $P \lesssim 0.1$ ), we present in Figure 8 the counterpart identifications to high- $z$   $500\mu\text{m}$  sources in the COSMOS field, where the higher resolution SCUBA-2  $450\mu\text{m}$  imaging allows for more precisely localizing the  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts. We found a similar trend of  $P$ -value against redshift as in Figure 5. At a  $P$ -value cut of  $\lesssim 0.1$ , most, if not all,  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources detected in the ratio map have






FIG. 7.— SCUBA-2 450 $\mu$ m image (left), *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m image (middle) and the *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m to *Spitzer* 24 $\mu$ m ratio map (right). The data are taken from observations of the COSMOS field. Sources that are detected in the ratio map are shown in red circles with a radius of 15'', while white shows those without counterparts in the 450 $\mu$ m map. Note that while many bright 500 $\mu$ m sources disappear in the ratio map, there are few faint sources being more unambiguously revealed in the ratio map.




FIG. 8.— Plot of redshift vs.  $P$ -value for all 24 $\mu$ m sources (filled squares) within the search radius of 15'', and counterparts to 500 $\mu$ m sources (red circles). Most high- $z$  candidate 500 $\mu$ m sources (red circles) identified with  $P \lesssim 0.1$  (at  $\gtrsim 90\%$  confidence) are also detected in the SCUBA-2 450 $\mu$ m imaging with higher resolution, suggesting that the rate of chance associations is low.

at least one 24 $\mu$ m counterpart at  $z \gtrsim 2$ . Most high- $z$  500 $\mu$ m sources that we identified are also detected in the SCUBA-2 450 $\mu$ m image with positions coincident with the 24 $\mu$ m counterpart, suggesting a low probability for chance associations. These results further support the reliability of our approach for counterpart identification. We therefore adopt a cut on the Poisson probabilities of  $P \lesssim 0.1$  for the counterpart identifications to our sample.

In Figure 9, we show examples of the identifications of two relatively clean sources from our catalog where the blending effect is small, as well as four sources in the COSMOS field. Though they could be also identified in the original 500 $\mu$ m map, this demonstrates that the detection in the ratio map is without any doubt coincident with a high- $z$  source: one is spectroscopically confirmed at  $z = 3.19$  and another has a photometric redshift at  $z = 4.15$ . Further support comes from the comparison with the SCUBA2 data at the 450 $\mu$ m, showing that can-

didate high- $z$  500 $\mu$ m sources have been unambiguously identified.

In order to considering alternative counterparts for the few sources with no 24 $\mu$ m counterpart, which may be an IRAC source with a predicted 500 $\mu$ m flux density greater than the one associated with the 24 $\mu$ m counterparts, we in fact considered two extrapolations of  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}$ , the one derived from the observed 24 $\mu$ m and the one derived from star-formation main-sequence relation (Column 8 in Table 1). The latter approach is based on redshift and stellar mass measurements, associating an SFR to each IRAC source using the main-sequence relation (Schreiber et al. 2015). The SFR was converted into a total IR luminosity using the Kennicutt (1998) relation<sup>16</sup>. We then assigned a favorable CE01 SED to each galaxy based on the IR luminosity to predict  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}$ . We used the UVJ selection technique (Whitaker et al. 2012) to isolated passive galaxies and excluded them from the counterpart catalog. Although the main-sequence approach provides only a lower limit to SFR and hence estimate of  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}$ , it will help to discriminate against candidates of high- $z$  passive galaxies which are undetected at 24 $\mu$ m. Note that 500 $\mu$ m detections that do not present 24 $\mu$ m counterparts fulfilling the  $P$ -value criterion will therefore be considered as 24 $\mu$ m dropouts.

Using the above procedure, we have found at least one 24 $\mu$ m counterpart for 28 (out of 36) sources detected in the ratio map (Table 1). In eight cases where no such counterparts can be found, we first proceed to search in the IRAC 3.6 $\mu$ m catalog using the same radius and  $P$ -value cut. This results in two further identifications in the IRAC band (GH500.01 and GH500.15). For the remaining six sources, we used the radio data for counterpart identifications. Out of a total of 36 sources, seven have more than one potential 24 $\mu$ m counterpart, and seven are found to have additional counterpart(s) from the IRAC identifications. Such multiple statistical asso-

<sup>16</sup> We used a mass-dependent dust extinction, i.e., IR excess  $\text{IRX} = \log_{10}(L_{\text{IR}}/L_{\text{UV}})$ , to decompose the SFR into a dust-obscured component seen in the FIR and a dust-free component which emerges in the UV (e.g., Heinis et al. 2014).




FIG. 9.— Examples of “clean” sources detected in the ratio map. Image cutouts from left to right: the  $24\mu\text{m}$ , the “beam-smoothed”  $24\mu\text{m}$  (Section 2.2), the  $500\mu\text{m}$ , the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio and the radio 1.4 GHz map. In the lower four panels, we also show example sources in the COSMOS field where the SCUBA2- $450\mu\text{m}$  image is available for direct comparison (last column).

ciations could be partly due to the source clustering at similar redshifts (e.g., GH500.26, GH500.27). Therefore, a unique counterpart is identifiable in about 60 per cent of the cases, while two or more candidates are present in others. For the latter case, we choose the one(s) detected in the radio (if available) as the most probable counterpart for further analysis (Table 2)<sup>17</sup>. Candidate *Spitzer* and radio counterparts and their computed  $P$ -statistics<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> For GH500.08, we choose the one of not being detected in the radio as best counterpart (see Appendix A.).

<sup>18</sup> In computing the  $P$ -statistics for the radio catalogue, we used the nominal method without taking into account the redshift

are given in Table 1.

We note that some bright silicate absorption galaxies at  $z \sim 0.4$  and  $z \sim 1.3$  which have depressed  $24\mu\text{m}$  emission (Magdis et al. 2011), may have elevated  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios meeting our selection criteria. By inspecting the photometric redshift and far-IR SED, we found one such lower- $z$  galaxy (GH500.06) that may co-incidently have a large  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio and we excluded it from our sample. In addition, there are five sources at redshifts less than 2 (GH500.03, GH500.11, GH500.22, GH500.24, GH500.36), among which three

information (e.g., Pope et al. 2006).




FIG. 10.— The rest-frame  $(U-V)$  vs.  $(V-J)$  color diagram for all IRAC sources within the search radii of  $15''$  (grey dots). Red solid circles represent secure Spitzer (radio)-identified  $500\mu\text{m}$  counterparts (Table 2 in the text), and those satisfying IRAC color selection for SMGs are highlighted in blue (Biggs et al. 2011).

are spectroscopically confirmed at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.6$ ,  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.76$  and  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.8$ , and another two has a photometric redshift of  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.61$  and  $z_{\text{phot}} = 0.60$ , respectively. As we are mainly interested in the  $z \gtrsim 2$  population of *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources, we exclude them from the following analysis.

For the remaining 35 sources (including four with more than one candidate counterpart), we provide the coordinates, photometric redshift (or spectroscopic redshift if available), mid-IR to radio flux densities, and the derived far-IR  $8\text{--}1000\mu\text{m}$  luminosity and dust temperature in Table 2. Their distribution in the rest-frame  $(U-V)$  vs.  $(V-J)$  color diagram is shown in Figure 10. It can be seen that most objects (32/36,  $\sim 90\%$ ) can be classified as dusty starburst galaxies (Whitaker et al. 2012), consistent with their high dust attenuation of  $A_V \sim 2$  mag inferred from the UV-MIR SED fittings. We note that there are two sources (GH500.10a and GH500.25) falling into the regime for quiescent galaxies. However, both are significantly detected in the *Herschel* PACS  $160\mu\text{m}$  ( $\sim 4\text{--}6$  mJy, Table 2), suggesting the presence of ongoing obscured star-formation. The possibility of wrong identifications seems low, as both are relatively isolated and well detected in the  $24\mu\text{m}$  and radio. Since the two sources have relatively high photometric redshift at  $z \gtrsim 4$  where the UVJ selection is still poorly explored (e.g., Straatman et al. 2013), whether they can be considered quenched remains further investigations. Indeed, their specific SFRs ( $8\text{--}40 \times 10^{-9}/\text{yr}$ ) are already  $>2\times$  higher than the  $\text{sSFR} = 5 \times 10^{-9}/\text{yr}$  of similarly massive star-forming galaxies at  $z > 3$  (Schreiber et al. 2015).

The *Herschel*/SPIRE fluxes are from the GOODS-*Herschel* catalog (Elbaz et al. 2011), or derived from point-spread function (PSF) fitting using GALFIT (Peng et al. 2002) for cases where the flux could be wrongly attributed to nearby  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources due to blending, or is not measured in the catalog. A description of the *Herschel*/SPIRE flux measurements is presented in Appendix B. Note that due to the poor resolution of the *Herschel* data, measuring reliable SPIRE flux densities for individual galaxies, especially those at  $500\mu\text{m}$ , is a

challenging task. The de-blending approach of using  $24\mu\text{m}$  data of better resolution would be still affected by the degeneracy between the positions of the sources and flux uncertainties attributed by faint sources. Given the case of heavily blending, the SPIRE flux measurements should be treated with some caution. The thumbnail images for each identified source are presented in Appendix C. Among 14 sources that have two or more candidate radio/ $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts, four (GH500.13, GH500.26, GH500.28, GH500.35) have counterparts separated by only  $\sim 5''$  or less. Three of these cases are treated as single systems because the counterparts are consistent with being at the same redshift and are assumed to be interacting galaxies. These three sources are so closely separated that deblending the *Herschel*/SPIRE flux is impossible, hence we report the combined fluxes of the two counterparts in Table 2. For GH500.35, we cannot assess whether the three counterpart galaxies are interacting systems or spatially clustered, and we assume that the source with the brightest  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux is the only counterpart, which should be treated with caution.

#### 2.3.4. Contaminants

We have visually inspected all sources which pass our S/N cut in order to search for noise artifacts and blends of bright sources. To check for false detections caused by map noise artifacts and/or from sources well below the nominal “flux” detection limit, we run our search procedure on the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map by removing all individually detected  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources in the catalog used in Elbaz et al. (2011). The P(D) plot of the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio map omitting all  $500\mu\text{m}$  detections in the existing catalog is shown in Figure 3 (red curve). It can be seen that few pixels have values above our S/N cut of  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}} = 20.4$ , suggesting that the contamination from noise artifacts is negligible. Figure 4 (lower panel) shows the number of spurious sources as a function of detection threshold. As one would expect, the number of false detections depends strongly on the chosen S/N threshold. At a  $2\sigma$  cut, the result suggests that two detections will be spurious in our ratio map, corresponding to a spurious source rate of  $\sim 6\%$  (2/36). Note that while increasing the S/N requirement would decrease the number of false sources, it would also remove a fraction of real but slightly fainter sources from the map. Therefore, we adopt  $2\sigma$  as the detection S/N cut for sources in the ratio map, because it provides a good compromise between the catalogue size and source reliability.

The above estimate, however, provides only a lower limit to the number of contaminants. As shown in Figure 1, the diversity in IR SED of galaxies means that lower redshift sources would have probabilities of being detected in the ratio map if they have similarly high  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios, contaminating the selection of  $z \gtrsim 2$  sources. We account for this effect statistically by performing simulations to measure the recovery rate for injected low- $z$  sources of varying flux density, using the similar procedure described in Section 2.3.1. For each injected source we assumed an IR SED randomly selected from the CE01 libraries to predict its  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux density at a given redshift. Note that we didn’t assume any peculiar IR SED for injected sources to avoid bias in detections. Although very “cold” galaxies have more chance of being detected, they are expected rare given



the small area covered by GOODS-North. Since lower redshift sources are not expected to be detected in our data except those with abnormal high  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios, any source recovered in the map would be considered as a contaminant. The average recovery rate for low- $z$  contaminants as a function of flux density is shown in Figure 4 (lower right panel). It can be seen that sources below  $z \sim 1.2$  have a low probability to be detected, but the detection rate increases with redshift above  $z \sim 1.4$  due to the increased fraction of sources with higher  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios. The low- $z$  contaminants become more significant at higher flux density, making them non-negligible effect in selecting  $z \gtrsim 2$  galaxies. In fact, such low- $z$  sources have been identified in the ratio map. As we mentioned above, we found 6 out of 36 sources at  $z < 2$  ( $\sim 17\%$ ) that could be contaminants in our catalog, which is consistent with the simulation result of  $\sim 20\%$  detection rate at  $\sim 15$  mJy, a median flux for catalog sources.

### 3. BASIC OBSERVED SOURCE PROPERTIES

#### 3.1. Redshift distribution

In this section, we present the redshift distribution for our  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* 500 $\mu\text{m}$  sources. To derive the redshift distribution, we take spectroscopic redshifts if available, based on optical and/or CO spectroscopic observations (Barger et al. 2008; Daddi et al. 2009a, b), and otherwise photometric redshifts based on a  $K_s$ -selected multi-wavelength photometric catalog (Pannella et al. 2015). Spectroscopic redshifts are available for 12 out of the 35 *Herschel* sources (33%) in the sample. Note that the photo- $z$  for one source (GH500.15) is not available, as it is not detected in the  $K_s$  band. Although SED fittings in the far-IR suggests it likely being at  $z \gtrsim 4$  (Section 4), we exclude the source in the following analysis due to the relatively poor constraint on the photo- $z$ .

The redshift distribution for the 34  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* sources identified from the ratio map is shown in the upper panel of Figure 11. For comparison, we also plot the redshift distribution for SMGs (red) from Chapman et al. (2005). Each distribution is normalized to the total number of sources in the sample. The redshift distribution derived by Chapman et al. (2005) is based on a sample of SMGs drawn from various SCUBA/850 $\mu\text{m}$  surveys with radio counterparts targeted for spectroscopic redshift follow-ups. It can be seen that the distribution of our  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ -selected sample is in sharp contrast to that SCUBA/850 $\mu\text{m}$  SMGs. The median redshift for our sample is  $z_{\text{med}}=3.07$ , with a significant fraction of sources (10/34, 29%) at  $z \gtrsim 4$ . The radio-identified SCUBA SMGs have a lower median redshift of  $z_{\text{med}}=2.6$  (considering only sources at  $z \gtrsim 2$ ), for which only 18% of the population is at  $z > 3$ . Part of this difference could be due to the identification bias in the sample of Chapman et al. The redshift distribution of SCUBA SMGs includes only sources with robust radio detections; the highest-redshift sources may fall below the depth of radio data and are likely to be missed. On the other hand, the sample considered here is confined to 500 $\mu\text{m}$  sources significantly detected in the ratio map which efficiently selects sources at the highest redshifts. Lower-redshift submm sources are down-weighted in the ratio map in an effort to obtain a homogenous sample of galaxies at

$z \gtrsim 2$  as possible.




FIG. 11.— *Upper*: The redshift distribution of the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ -selected sources in the GOODS-North field (black line, normalized by the total). The red dotted histogram is the redshift distribution of SCUBA 850 $\mu\text{m}$  sources from Chapman et al. (2005). For comparison, the blue dashed histogram shows the distribution of spectroscopic redshifts for  $2 < z < 5$  SPIRE sources from Casey et al. (2012b). The excess number of objects at  $4.0 < z < 4.5$  may be due to cosmic variance and the presence of a high-redshift proto-cluster (Daddi et al. 2009b). *Lower*:  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  flux ratio as a function of redshift. Black curves are model SEDs of Arp220 (dashed), a main-sequence galaxy template (solid) from Magdis et al. (2012), M82 (dot-dashed) and Mrk231 (dotted). The shaded region represents the range of the CE01 models, and the blue solid line is the median trend of  $z < 2$  *Herschel*/SPIRE sources from Casey et al. 2012(a). Filled squares are  $z \gtrsim 2$  sources identified from the ratio map, with spectroscopically confirmed ones highlighted by red circles. Large open squares denote galaxies whose 500 $\mu\text{m}$  emission is less than  $3\sigma$ .

A recently published spectroscopic survey of *Herschel* /SPIRE sources with optical counterparts determined from high-resolution radio/24 $\mu\text{m}$  imaging found a population of ULIRGs at  $2 < z < 5$  (Casey et al. 2012b), and a median redshift of  $z_{\text{med}} = 3.38$  (blue dashed line in Figure 11, upper). It should be noted that this population is only a tail of spectroscopically confirmed *Herschel* sources in their survey, the majority of them ( $\sim 95\%$ ) being at  $z < 2$  (Casey et al. 2012a). Though the sample of  $z > 2$  *Herschel* sources in Casey et al. (2012b) is likely biased towards optically bright population for which spectroscopic identifications are made,




FIG. 12.— Infrared luminosity (8–1000 $\mu$ m) against redshift for the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ -selected  $z \gtrsim 2$  ULIRGs (filled red circles) in the GOODS-North field. The *Herschel*/SPIRE-selected, spectroscopically confirmed sources at  $2 < z < 5$  (open circles; Casey et al. 2012b) are overplotted for comparison. The detection boundaries as a function of redshift for  $T_d = 30$  K (blue dashed line) and  $T_d = 40$  K (green dashed line) are illustrated, assuming a flux limit of 9 mJy at 500 $\mu$ m.

the redshift distribution appears similar to that derived from our sample. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test shows that the probability that both samples are drawn from the same underlying parent distribution is 0.43. Note that while the Casey et al. (2012b) redshift distribution is relatively flat from  $z=2$  to 5, our sample shows a tentative excess at  $z \gtrsim 4$ . This could be due to cosmic variance, since our sample probes a small volume in a single field, while the Casey et al. data cover several deep fields over a much larger ( $\gtrsim 5$  times) sky area<sup>19</sup>. In fact, Daddi et al. (2009b) have reported a proto-cluster structure at  $z = 4.05$  in the GOODS-North field (see their Figure 13) which includes three CO-detected SMGs within  $\sim 25''$  at the same redshift.

Using a  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio method, we find 10 *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m sources at  $z \gtrsim 4$  in the GOODS-North field, corresponding to  $\sim 29\%$  of the whole sample. Eight of these  $z \gtrsim 4$  candidates have  $S_{500\mu\text{m}} > 10$  mJy. This suggests significantly more ULIRGs at the highest-redshift end compared to other surveys (e.g., Smolčić et al. 2012 and references therein). This will enrich our understanding of obscured star formation in the early Universe. Excluding four spectroscopically confirmed  $z > 4$  sources at the same redshift which are likely associated with a protocluster at  $z \sim 4.05$  (Daddi et al. 2009a, b), we can place a lower limit on the surface density of  $z > 4$  ULIRGs at  $\gtrsim 6/0.05 = 120 \text{ deg}^{-2}$ . This value is more than an order of magnitude higher than what is expected in cosmological models (Baugh et al. 2005; Swinbank et al. 2008; Coppin et al. 2009; Béthermin et al. 2012). However, given the very small area covered by GOODS-N and lack of the spectroscopic confirmation for most candidates, these values should be taken with caution.

<sup>19</sup> Casey et al. (2012b) sample comes from a spectroscopic survey of bright SPIRE sources ( $>10$ –12 mJy) in four HerMES legacy fields, including the Lockman Hole, COSMOS, ELAIS-N1 and ECDFS (see their Table 1).

A complete view of the properties of the  $z > 4$  ULIRG population will require a detailed submm follow-up and robustly determined redshifts. Notably, recent ALMA follow-up of a bright sample of lensed SMGs discovered with the SPT yielded at least 10 spectroscopically confirmed sources at  $z > 4$  (Vieira et al. 2013; Weiß et al. 2013), challenging the current models for galaxy formation and evolution.

In Figure 11 (lower panel), we show the measured  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio (Table 2) for each of our  $z \gtrsim 2$  sources as a function of redshift, along with the various model SED predictions. The  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios of our galaxies are all over 30, and are in good agreement with the dusty SEDs allowed by current models, albeit with a large scatter. The large  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios therefore support the expectation that most sources, if not all, in our sample are indeed at  $z \gtrsim 2$ . In the next section, we will investigate the far-IR properties of individual galaxies.

### 3.2. Infrared luminosities and dust properties

To derive the far-IR emission and SED characteristics of the sample, we fit the photometry with a library of galaxy templates including CE01 and the well-studied SEDs of the local starburst M82, the ULIRG Arp220 and the dusty AGN Mrk231. The SEDs for the latter three local galaxies are taken from the SWIRE template library (Polletta et al. 2007). Our library consists of a total of 108 templates with characteristic dust temperatures ( $T_d$ ) in the range  $T_d \sim 20 - 60$  K. The SED fitting results are shown in Figure D1 in the Appendix, and their infrared luminosities and dust temperatures are given in Table 1.

We compute the infrared luminosity of each source by integrating the best-fit SED between rest-frame 8 and 1000 $\mu$ m. The luminosities for this sample range from  $1.5 \times 10^{12} - 1.8 \times 10^{13} L_\odot$ , implying infrared SFRs of  $\sim 260 - 3100 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$  with a Salpeter IMF. Note that the IR luminosities can be determined to less than 50% accuracy when excluding SPIRE 350 and 500 $\mu$ m measurements for 60 per cent of sources where the data at longer wavelengths ( $>500\mu\text{m}$ ) are available. This suggests that they are among the most extreme star-forming galaxies seen in the early Universe (e.g., Casey et al. 2014 and references therein). Figure 12 shows the infrared luminosity against redshift (filled red circles). The distribution of the Casey et al. (2012b) spectroscopically confirmed sample of  $2 < z < 5$  SPIRE sources is shown for comparison (open circles). Our  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ -selected population and the Casey et al. (2012b) sample each probe different regions of parameter space. Though the redshift distribution is similar (Section 3.1), our sources are systematically lower in luminosity by  $\sim 0.1 - 0.5$  dex at a fixed redshift. While the Casey et al. (2012b)  $z > 2$  sample may not be representative of all high- $z$  500 $\mu$ m sources due to their selection of brighter objects for spectroscopy follow-ups, our selection is offering a unique probe of intrinsically fainter objects, which is important for a complete view of the properties of the  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* population. Note that, as we mentioned above, it is important to understand the different volumes probed for a more meaningful comparison of the typical luminosities in the two samples.

The dust temperature is derived using the code of Casey (2012), which fits the far-IR photometry with an




FIG. 13.— Effective dust temperature ( $T_d$ ) versus total far-IR luminosity ( $L_{8-1000\mu m}$ ), for  $z < 1$  galaxies (blue line and diamonds: SPIRE sample of Symeonidis et al. 2013; black crosses: SMG sample of Chapman et al. 2005),  $z = 1-3$  SMGs+Herschel galaxies (open squares, Magnelli et al. 2012) and our  $z \gtrsim 2$   $S_{500\mu m}/S_{24\mu m}$ -selected sample (red filled diamonds). Colored dashed lines: transition of our detection limit of  $S_{500\mu m} = 9$  mJy for three redshifts,  $z=2$  (green),  $z=3$  (red) and  $z=4$  (blue). Black dashed line: extrapolation of the  $T_d$ - $L_{IR}$  relation for  $z < 1$  SPIRE sample of Symeonidis et al. (2013).

SED consisting of a modified blackbody spectrum and a power-law component in the mid-IR portion ( $\lesssim 40\mu m$ ). The combination of a greybody and mid-IR power-law takes into account both galaxy-wide cold dust emission and smaller-scale warm dust emission (e.g., Kovács et al. 2006; Casey 2012). To reduce the number of free parameters, we fix the slope of the mid-IR power-law to  $\alpha = 2$  for sources which are not detected in PACS. In addition, the emissivity index of the blackbody spectrum on the Rayleigh-Jeans portion is fixed to  $\beta = 1.5$  (a commonly chosen value of  $\beta$  in the literature, e.g., Chapman et al. 2005; Pope et al. 2005; Younger et al. 2009), since we have not enough data points at longer wavelengths ( $\gtrsim 850\mu m$ ) to constrain  $\beta$  in a meaningful way. However, we note that there is very little change in the derived  $T_d$  by fixing  $\beta$  within the range of 1 – 2.

We present in Figure 13 the dust temperature against infrared luminosity for the  $z \gtrsim 2$  sources in our sample which have a meaningful constraint on the dust temperature from the submm and/or mm measurements. We include in the comparison the measurements for SCUBA SMGs from Chapman et al. (2005) as well as the  $z = 0-1$  SPIRE galaxies from Symeonidis et al. (2013), which appear to closely follow the relation that the dust temperature increases with infrared luminosity, as observed in the local IRAS  $60\mu m$ -selected sample (e.g., Chapman et al. 2003). To examine whether our high- $z$  sample has temperatures similar to those of local samples and at  $z < 1$ , we divided our sample into two bins of  $L_{IR}$  with roughly equal numbers of sources:  $12.2 \leq \log_{10}(L_{IR}/L_{\odot}) \leq 12.8$  and  $12.8 \leq \log_{10}(L_{IR}/L_{\odot}) \leq 13.4$ . The derived median temperatures and luminosities are  $T_d = 31.0 \pm 1.6$  and  $36.5 \pm 6.3$  K for  $L_{IR} = 4.0$  and  $8.7 \times 10^{12} L_{\odot}$ , respectively. As Figure 13 shows, at a fixed luminosity the high- $z$

galaxies in our sample tend to have cooler dust temperatures ( $\delta T_d \sim 5$  K) compared to that expected from the  $L_{IR} - T_d$  relation of  $z = 0-1$  SPIRE galaxies (Symeonidis et al. 2013). This could be partially due to the selection in the  $500\mu m$  band, which is biased against the warmer sources, even at these high redshifts.

By comparing the dust properties between local galaxies ( $z < 0.1$ ) observed with *AKARI* and galaxies in the redshift range  $0.1 \lesssim z \lesssim 2.8$  selected by *Herschel*, Hwang et al. (2010) found modest changes in the  $L_{IR} - T_d$  relation as a function of redshift. *Herschel*-selected galaxies appear to be 2-5 K colder than that of *AKARI*-selected local galaxies with similar luminosities. Such evolution of the  $L_{IR} - T_d$  relation with redshift has also been reported by the studies of Rex et al. (2010) and Chapin et al. (2011), and recently by Symeonidis et al. (2013) and Swinbank et al. (2014) with a much larger *Herschel* dataset. The offset in the  $L_{IR} - T_d$  relation may imply that high- $z$  ULIRGs have a weaker average interstellar radiation field than local analogs of a similar luminosity, which could be due to a more extended distribution of dust and gas (e.g., Hwang et al. 2010). However, we note that dust temperatures derived in this work and others in the literature suppose that the emission-weighted sum of all the dust components could be well fitted by a single modified blackbody model. In reality, the far-IR emission of a galaxy results from the combination of a series of blackbodies associated to a temperature distribution depending on a number of factors, including dust emission spectral index, dust grain distribution and geometry (e.g., Casey 2012; Magnelli et al. 2012), that is often summarized by an effective dust temperature associated to the peak emission of the far-IR SED.




FIG. 14.— Radio-to-far-IR correlation coefficient ( $q_{IR}$ ) as a function of far-IR luminosity (left) and redshift (right). The solid and dashed lines represent the median and  $2\sigma$  values for SPIRE sources from Ivison et al. (2010b). Good agreement is seen with the Ivison et al. (2010b) results, and no significant evolution with redshift is observed (right). The red line shows the moderate redshift evolution of  $q \propto (1+z)^{-0.04 \pm 0.03}$  obtained by Ivison et al. (2010b) for comparison.

### 3.3. High- $z$ Radio/far-IR relation

For the 28 radio-detected sources, we measured the far-IR/radio ratio,  $q_{IR}$ , to investigate the far-IR/radio



correlation for ULIRGs at  $z > 2$ . The tightness of the far-IR/radio relation is very useful in many aspects in the study of galaxy evolution, e.g., estimate of the SFR of dusty starbursts in the absence of far-IR data (Condon 1992; Barger et al. 2012), and search for radio-excess AGN (Del Moro et al. 2013). However, controversial results have been obtained in literature studies on the evolution of such relation. Recent studies based on *Herschel* data claimed a redshift evolution of the correlation (e.g., Ivison et al. 2010a; Casey et al. 2012a, b; Magnelli et al. 2010, 2012, 2014; Thomson et al. 2014). On the contrary, Sargent et al. (2010) showed that, by taking into account the sample selection effect, the far-IR/radio relation is roughly invariant up to redshift  $z = 1$ , and possibly up to higher redshift (in agreement with Bourne et al. 2011; Barger et al. 2012; Pannella et al. 2014). Both results are inconsistent with the theoretical prediction that this tight relationship should break down at high redshift due to rapid Compton cooling of the relativistic electrons (e.g., Condon 1992).

We use the ratio ( $q_{\text{IR}}$ ) of rest-frame 8–1000  $\mu\text{m}$  flux to 1.4 GHz radio flux as defined in Ivison et al. (2010a). The rest-frame radio power was computed assuming  $S_\nu \propto \nu^{-\alpha}$  and a radio spectral index of  $\alpha = 0.8$  (e.g., Thomson et al. 2014). For these radio detected sources, the measured  $q_{\text{IR}}$  ranges from 1.04 to 2.76 with a median value of 2.37. In Figure 14, we plot the  $q_{\text{IR}}$  versus (left) their far-IR luminosities and (right) their redshifts. Using the *Herschel* data in the GOODS North field, Ivison et al. (2010b) performed a stacking analysis of 24  $\mu\text{m}$ -selected galaxies at  $z = 0 - 2$ , and found a median value of  $q_{\text{IR}} = 2.4$  (solid line in Figure 14) and a scatter of 0.24 (dashed lines). Our  $z \gtrsim 2$  galaxies have  $q_{\text{IR}}$  values in good agreement with this range. Only three galaxies (GH500.21, GH500.27c, and GH500.30) in Figure 14 lie off the far-IR/radio correlation. This is likely due to the existence of a strong AGN, which contributes significantly to the radio emission hence lowers the  $q_{\text{IR}}$  (e.g., Del Moro et al. 2013). This is consistent with the observed excess of 24  $\mu\text{m}$  emission in GH500.30 (see Figure D1 in the Appendix). We note that our selection is not sensitive to high- $z$  AGN, which are expected to be bright at 24  $\mu\text{m}$  and thus have depressed  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratios unless they are extremely luminous in the far-IR.

Since the radio continuum of galaxies without strong AGN is predominantly produced by supernova remnants from young stellar populations, our results suggest that the far-IR luminosity for high- $z$  *Herschel* sources is dominated by heated dust emission due to star-forming process in massive galaxies, with little contribution from old stars. Parameterizing the  $q_{\text{IR}}$  evolution in the form  $q_{\text{IR}} \propto (1+z)^\gamma$ , and excluding three galaxies with a strong AGN contribution to the radio emission, we find  $\gamma = 0.05 \pm 0.05$ , which is consistent with no evolution. For comparison, Ivison et al. (2010b) found a slight evolution with  $\gamma = -0.04 \pm 0.03$  (red solid curve with dotted  $\pm 1\sigma$  uncertainties). By extending to higher redshifts (out to  $z = 4.6$ ) than most other studies, our data suggest no evolution of  $q_{\text{IR}}$ . This agrees with the recent finding by Pannella et al. (2014), who studied the far-IR/radio correlation up to  $z \simeq 4$  in a stacking analysis of *Herschel* data for a mass-selected sample of star-forming galaxies.




FIG. 15.— Far-IR SED of a mis-identified  $z = 3.4$  *Herschel* source GH500.19 (red squares). The best-fit CE01 template at  $z = 3.4$  is shown by the red line, while the black dotted line is the best fit at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$  to all data points from 24  $\mu\text{m}$  to radio. It is clear that the best-fit SED at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$  ( $\chi^2 = 51.2$ ) is much poorer than that at  $z = 3.4$  ( $\chi^2 = 1.38$ ). The  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$  source can only have a significant contribution to the *Herschel* fluxes at shorter wavelengths (black open circles).

## 4. DISCUSSION

### 4.1. Misidentified high-redshift sources in the *Herschel* catalog

The large beam sizes (FWHM  $\sim 20\text{--}40''$ ) of the *Herschel*/SPIRE images mean that obtaining robust multi-wavelength identifications and photometry for SPIRE sources is challenging. *Herschel* point source photometry is frequently performed by flux extraction at positions of known 24  $\mu\text{m}$  sources or 1.4 GHz radio sources (e.g., Elbaz et al. 2011; Roseboom et al. 2010, 2012), as these wavelengths have much better resolution ( $\sim 1\text{--}5''$ ) and, like *Herschel*, are good tracers of star-formation activity (e.g., Ivison et al. 2010a). However, this is particularly problematic for high-redshift sources that are faint or undetected in 24  $\mu\text{m}$  and radio surveys, resulting in ambiguous and/or incorrect counterpart identifications (Roseboom et al. 2010; Yan et al. 2014).

Our map-based approach has the advantage of identifying the correct counterparts to high- $z$  *Herschel* sources which are bright at 500  $\mu\text{m}$  but relatively faint at 24  $\mu\text{m}$ . When using 24  $\mu\text{m}$  priors for a *Herschel* catalog, if the SPIRE beam contains several blended 24  $\mu\text{m}$  sources that cannot be deblended, the brightest 24  $\mu\text{m}$  source is usually chosen as the counterpart. This can lead to misidentifications for high- $z$  sources as we show in Figure 15 for the case of GH500.19. Within the 500  $\mu\text{m}$  beam, there are two closely-separated ( $< 10''$ ) 24  $\mu\text{m}$  sources, one spectroscopically confirmed at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$  and another at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.41$ , both possibly contributing to the *Herschel* flux. While the far-IR emission is taken to be associated with the galaxy at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$ , the far-IR SED is inconsistent with the low-redshift solution. At  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$ , the fit to the IR photometry has  $\chi^2 > 50$  for all the templates in the library, with a minimized  $\chi^2 = 51.2$  (dotted line). In contrast, the best-




FIG. 16.— Cutout images for three  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources which are not detected at  $24\mu\text{m}$ , from left to right: ground-based  $K_s$ -band, IRAC/ $8\mu\text{m}$ , MIPS/ $24\mu\text{m}$ , SPIRE/ $500\mu\text{m}$ ,  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ , and VLA 1.4GHz. The smaller white square indicates the counterpart identified from the radio or IRAC. The dashed circle represents the search radius of  $15''$ , centered on the source position determined by SExtractor, while the solid circle indicates the beam FWHM of  $500\mu\text{m}$  with a radius of  $18''$ . The non-detections at  $24\mu\text{m}$  and the red colors ( $K_s - [3.6\mu\text{m}] > 2$ ) suggest that they are likely to be extremely dust-obscured galaxies at  $z \gtrsim 3$ . The images are 1 arcmin on a side.

fitting template at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.41$  yielded a much lower  $\chi^2 = 1.38$  (red solid line). We therefore conclude that the  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.41$  galaxy is likely to be the true counterpart to the *Herschel* source, and the low-redshift candidate at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$  is ruled out. Our method correctly identified the  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.41$  object as the counterpart, while in this case the usual radio identification would favor the low-redshift counterpart, which is the brightest radio source within the *Herschel* beam.

By effectively reducing the confusion from low- $z$  sources using the map-based  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  ratio, we have identified three potential high- $z$   $500\mu\text{m}$  sources that are not detected at  $24\mu\text{m}$ , of which two are likely to be at  $z > 4$ . In Figure 16, we present the images in the ground-based  $K_s$  band, IRAC  $8\mu\text{m}$ , MIPS  $24\mu\text{m}$ , *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$ , the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map, and the VLA radio image. There is no  $24\mu\text{m}$  source within  $5''$  of the radio counterpart, while a galaxy is clearly detected by *Spitzer* in all four IRAC bands. All three sources are relatively faint in the  $K_s$  band, and the extremely red colors of  $K_s - [3.6\mu\text{m}] > 2$ , if due to the strong, redshifted Balmer/4000Å break of an evolved stellar population, imply that they are likely at  $z > 3$ . Indeed, the photometric redshift analysis suggests that two of them are at  $z = 2.9$  and  $z = 4.2$  respectively. The remaining source, which is not seen at  $K_s$  and shorter wavelengths, is a bright submm source (Pope et al. 2006; Perera et al. 2007; Barger et al. 2014). Since there is no photometric redshift available for this galaxy, we fitted its far-IR to radio photometry with a suite of CE01 templates, and found a best-fit redshift of  $z = 4.4$ . The high redshifts of  $24\mu\text{m}$ -dropout *Herschel* sources which have properties very similar to the well-studied SMG GN10, if confirmed, would have important implications for galaxy formation and evolution.

To summarize, among 36 unique  $z \gtrsim 2$   $500\mu\text{m}$  sources

identified in this paper, we find five cases ( $\sim 14\%$ ) where the  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux is incorrectly associated with a brighter  $24\mu\text{m}$  prior in the official *Herschel* catalog. Three high- $z$   $500\mu\text{m}$  sources that are not detected at  $24\mu\text{m}$  are revealed in the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map ( $\sim 8\%$ , see Section 4.2). In three further cases, the *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux in the catalog is probably given to nearby sources due to strong source blending ( $\sim 8\%$ ). Therefore, using the deepest  $24\mu\text{m}$  and  $500\mu\text{m}$  imaging in the GOODS-N field, we estimate that at least 20% of  $z > 2$  dust obscured galaxies in our sample were mis-identified or missed in the current catalog. This missing fraction of high- $z$  ULIRGs population should be taken into account in studies of starburst galaxies in the early Universe. Due to the small volume of the GOODS-N field, it is important to apply our method to larger survey fields with comparable depths (e.g. HerMES) to build a statistically significant and more complete sample of  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* sources. However, detailed, high-resolution submm interferometric follow-ups, e.g., with NOEMA or ALMA, are required to *unambiguously* identify the correct SPIRE source counterparts, and resolve their multiplicities.

While *Herschel* is highly sensitive to  $z \sim 1-2$  galaxies whose SED peaks in the far-IR, the long-wavelength submm bands (such as  $850\mu\text{m}$  and  $1\text{mm}$ ) are optimized for higher-redshift galaxies. It is thus interesting to compare the *Herschel* galaxies with submm sources detected by SCUBA (for example). Among our 34 *Herschel* sources, 20 have been previously reported as SMGs selected at  $850\mu\text{m}$  (Pope et al. 2006; Wall et al. 2008), although three are outside of the SCUBA coverage. Therefore, twelve of our sources are not listed in the  $850\mu\text{m}$  catalog. In Figure 17, we show the locations of sources with and without  $850\mu\text{m}$  detections on the  $S_{850\mu\text{m}}-z$  and  $S_{850\mu\text{m}}-L_{\text{IR}}$  planes. We find that there is a correlation between  $S_{850\mu\text{m}}$  and  $L_{\text{IR}}$ , although it is subject to possi-

ble selection effects, as submm observations could be biased against galaxies with warm dust temperatures and therefore relatively faint  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux densities for the same total luminosity (e.g., Chapman et al. 2010).

Using the best-fitting dust SED, the predicted  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux densities (open circles in the lower panel of Figure 17) for our *Herschel* sample appear to be consistent with the  $S_{850\mu\text{m}}-L_{\text{IR}}$  relation. These sources have fitted SED dust temperatures in the range of 30–40 K (Table 1), hence their non-detections in  $850\mu\text{m}$  cannot be simply attributed to the selection effect. In fact, most of galaxies which have not been detected in  $850\mu\text{m}$  lie at the edge of GOODS-North field where the local noise level of SCUBA map is relatively high (e.g., Pope et al. 2006). The median noise value for the non-detections is 3.1 mJy, compared to the 0.9 mJy for those detected by SCUBA in our sample. As illustrated in Figure 17 (lower panel), most of the non-detections could be due to the relatively low S/N given their expected  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux densities. More sensitive submm imaging of the GOODS-North field, e.g. from SCUBA-2 (Geach et al. 2013), may detect the  $850\mu\text{m}$  emission in these high- $z$  *Herschel* sources and enable a more detailed study of their dust properties.

#### 4.2. Implications for Star-formation-rate density

The star-formation-rate density (SFRD) represents the total star formation occurring per unit comoving volume. The importance of ULIRGs to the buildup of stellar mass can be determined by comparing their SFRD contribution to other galaxy populations (i.e. UV-selected). This is particularly important for understanding the role of dust obscuration at high redshifts. At lower redshifts ( $z \lesssim 1$ ), ULIRGs are rare and their contribution to the SFRD is negligible. However, the importance of ULIRGs grows towards  $z \sim 2$ , where they could contribute half of the total SFRD (e.g., Le Floc'h et al. 2005; Magnelli et al. 2013). At  $z \gtrsim 2$ , the contribution of ULIRGs to the SFRD is highly uncertain due to their limited numbers (Chapman et al. 2005; Wardlow et al. 2011; Michałowski et al. 2010a). Our  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* sample therefore provides an important opportunity to investigate the SFRD contribution from the high- $z$  ULIRG population.

To estimate the contribution of our  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* sources to the cosmic SFRD, we used the Kennicutt (1998) relation to convert the far-IR (8–1000 $\mu\text{m}$ ) luminosity into a dust-obscured SFR, assuming a non-evolving Salpeter IMF (Section 3.2). We split the individual SFR measurements into two redshift bins:  $1.9 < z < 3.1$  and  $3.1 < z < 4.7$  with 18 sources in the former and 16 in the latter. The SFRD in each redshift bin was measured by dividing the SFR of each galaxy in that bin by the comoving volume and summing them. We correct this number by the ratio  $V/V_{\text{max}}$  for each individual source, where  $V_{\text{max}}$  is the maximum accessible volume within which a source could reside and still be detectable by our survey.  $V_{\text{max}}$  is calculated using the survey area of GOODS-North and the luminosity detection limit which is determined by setting a flux limit of 9 mJy at  $500\mu\text{m}$  ( $3\sigma$  detection threshold, Elbaz et al. 2011).

We note that the SFRs of individual sources could be affected by gravitational lensing, which would make the observed IR luminosities artificially large, thus overesti-




FIG. 17.— Submm flux densities as a function of redshift (upper panel) and far-IR luminosity (lower panel). For sources not detected in SCUBA  $850\mu\text{m}$ , we plot the  $3\sigma$  upper limits on flux (downward arrows) and IR SED-predicted  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux densities (open circles). Solid and dashed lines show the linear fit (in log space) to the  $S_{850\mu\text{m}} - L_{\text{IR}}$  relation for the galaxies detected in the submm. Dotted lines represent the  $S_{850\mu\text{m}} - L_{\text{IR}}$  relation for a galaxy at  $z = 2$ , with a single modified blackbody at 30 and 50 K, respectively.

mate the SFRs. The probability of lensing as a function of  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux density (see Wardlow et al. 2013, Figure 9) suggests that galaxies with  $S_{500} < 80$  mJy have a low probability of  $\lesssim 1\%$  being lensed by a factor of  $\geq 2$ . Wardlow et al. (2013) also show that there is little dependence of the conditional magnification probability on redshift at  $z > 2$ . Note that the brightest source in our sample (GN500.19, also known as GN20) has  $S_{500} = 46.6$  mJy, and only three sources are above  $\sim 30$  mJy (see Table 1). For the median value of  $S_{500} = 13.9$  mJy for  $z \gtrsim 2$  SPIRE sources in this sample, the predicted lensed factor would be less than 2. Therefore, the gravitational lensing effect (if there is any) would not change significantly the *Herschel* source contribution to the SFRD. Source clustering can boost the flux at the  $500\mu\text{m}$  by  $\sim 20\%$  on average (Schreiber et al. 2015), but since such clustering only affects sources at the same redshift, it does not change our SFRD estimation for the given redshift bin.

The contribution of our sample to the SFRD is shown in Figure 18 as black filled squares. We compare our results with previous works based on the SMG samples






FIG. 18.— The estimated contribution of  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ -selected galaxies at  $z \gtrsim 2$  (black filled squares) to the cosmic SFRD. The open squares are for the spectroscopically confirmed subsample. The data points are shown at the median redshift in each redshift bin, and error bars on SFRD are a combination of  $1\sigma$  Poissonian error on the number of sources and the typical IR luminosity error of  $\sim 0.15$  dex. The black curve shows the UV-based SFRD from a compilation by Madau & Dickinson (2014), while the red curve is its rescaling by a factor of 0.4. The literature SFRD values for comparison are from Chapman et al. (2005)  $850\mu\text{m}$ -selected SMGs (blue diamonds), Wardlow et al. (2011)  $870\mu\text{m}$ -selected SMGs (purple triangles), and *Herschel*-SPIRE spectroscopically confirmed  $2 < z < 5$  sources (filled grey circles) from Casey (2012b). We observe an increase in the ULIRGs' contribution to the SFRD from  $z \sim 2.5$  to  $z \sim 4$ , consistent with the trend seen in Casey (2012b), when taking into account the sources with less confident spectroscopic redshifts in their sample (open circle).

of Chapman et al. (2005, blue diamonds) and Wardlow et al. (2011, purple triangles). Using our new technique to explore the dusty, high-redshift star-forming galaxies seen by *Herschel*, we recover more of the obscured cosmic star formation as shown in Figure 18. In particular, we observe an increase of the ULIRGs' contribution to the SFRD from  $z \sim 2.5$  to  $z \sim 4$  (filled squares). Note that Casey et al. (2012b) found a similar increase in the SFRD contribution from their  $z > 2$  SPIRE-selected galaxies (open circle in their Figure 9), when taking into account the sources with less confident spectroscopic redshifts in the bin  $3.2 < z < 5.0$ . The results imply that extremely dusty starbursts may contribute significantly to the build-up of stellar mass in the early Universe (about 40% of extinction-corrected UV samples, e.g., Madau & Dickinson 2014)<sup>20</sup>. This result may be affected by cosmic variance in the GOODS-North field where the number of high- $z$  ULIRGs is systematically high compared to other surveys (Section 3.1). Conversely, if we consider only the spectroscopically-confirmed subsample, the SFRD contribution of our *Herschel*-selected ULIRGs (open squares) is similar to that of SMGs, which peaks at  $z \sim 2.2$ . Future spectroscopic observations of the other candidates in our sample, in particular those at  $z \gtrsim 4$ , are therefore required to more robustly constrain their SFRD contribution, and to understand the importance of dust-obscured star-forming activity in ULIRGs in the first few Gyr of the Universe.

<sup>20</sup> Our SFRD is strictly a lower limit to the contribution from the overall ULIRG population, since we have not corrected for incompleteness in the sample.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we present a new, map-based method to select candidate  $z \gtrsim 2$  ULIRGs using the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  color. Our approach offers a relatively unbiased search for ULIRGs at  $z \gtrsim 2$ , and recovers a fraction of  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources which would otherwise be misidentified and/or missed due to incorrect  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart associations or non-detections at  $24\mu\text{m}$ . We provide a catalog of 34  $z \gtrsim 2$  dusty galaxies (all ULIRGs) uniformly selected in the GOODS-North field, and the main results are as follows:

- From a combination of spectroscopic (comprising 34% of the sample) and photometric redshifts, we found that our *Herschel*-selected galaxies have a median redshift of  $z = 3.1 \pm 0.8$  and 10 of them are at  $z \gtrsim 4$ . The redshift distribution is different from that of the SCUBA  $850\mu\text{m}$ -selected SMGs ( $S_{850\mu\text{m}} \gtrsim 5$  mJy), but is consistent with SPIRE-selected galaxies between  $2 < z < 5$  from the spectroscopic survey of Casey et al. (2012b), though the latter sample has IR luminosities systematically higher by  $\sim 0.6$  dex on average. The observed  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  colors are in agreement with the dusty SEDs allowed for normal low- $z$  star-forming galaxies, albeit with a large scatter.
- We observe a correlation between dust temperature and infrared luminosity. The median far-IR luminosity is  $L_{\text{far-IR}} = 6.5 \times 10^{12} L_{\odot}$ , which corresponds to a median SFR =  $1100 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ , with a range of  $260 - 3100 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  (assuming a Salpeter IMF). The median dust temperature is  $T_d = 32.3 \pm 5.2 \text{ K}$ . In comparison with  $z \lesssim 1$  *Herschel*-selected galaxies from Symeonidis et al. (2013), we find that at a fixed luminosity, our sample has cooler dust temperatures than that extrapolated from the  $L_{\text{IR}} - T_d$  relation at  $z \lesssim 1$ , which may be attributed to the more extended gas and dust distribution in the high- $z$  ULIRGs. The result could also be partially explained by the selection at  $500\mu\text{m}$ , even at these high-redshifts, which biases towards galaxies with colder dust temperatures for a fixed luminosity.
- The radio-detected subset of our sample (28/34, excluding three likely strong AGN) follows the far-IR/radio correlation from previous work (Ivison et al. 2010a, b) with a median value of  $q_{\text{IR}} = 2.37$ . The result is consistent with no evolution of the correlation with redshift out to  $z \sim 5$ .
- By splitting the sample into two redshift bins ( $1.9 < z < 3.1$  and  $3.1 < z < 4.7$ ), we find that the contribution from our sample to the overall SFRD at  $z \sim 2.5$  is comparable to  $850\mu\text{m}$ -selected SMGs and *Herschel*/SPIRE-selected ULIRGs. However, in the higher-redshift bin ( $z \sim 4$ ), the SFRD contribution of our sample appears to be a factor of 5 – 10 higher than that of SMGs, and is about 40% of that of UV-selected star-forming galaxies. We caution that this result may be affected by cosmic variance and apparent overdensity of  $z \sim 4$  ULIRGs in the GOODS-North field. Future exploration of the  $z \gtrsim 4$  ULIRGs population in larger

survey fields and spectroscopic follow-ups will be crucial to set more robust constraints on their contribution to the cosmic SFRD.

This work is based on observations taken by the GOODS-Herschel Program, and is supported by the European Union Seventh Framework Programme

(FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n. 312725. X.W.S. thanks the support from Chinese NSF through grant 11103017, 11233002, 11421303, and Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (No. 20123402110030). Partial support for this work was provided by National Basic Research Program 2015CB857004. R.L. acknowledges support from the FONDECYT grant 3130558.

## REFERENCES

- Barger, A. J., Cowie, L. L., & Wang, W.-H. 2008, *ApJ*, 689, 687
- Barger, A. J., Wang, W.-H., Cowie, L. L., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 761, 89
- Barger, A. J., Cowie, L. L., Chen, C.-C., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 9
- Baugh, C. M., Lacey, C. G., Frenk, C. S., et al. 2005, *MNRAS*, 356, 1191
- Bertin, E., & Arnouts, S. 1996, *A&AS*, 117, 393
- Béthermin, M., Daddi, E., Magdis, G., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 757, L23
- Biggs, A. D., Ivison, R. J., Ibar, E., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 413, 2314
- Borys, C., Chapman, S., Halpern, M., & Scott, D. 2003, *MNRAS*, 344, 385
- Bourne, N., Dunne, L., Ivison, R. J., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 410, 1155
- Capak, P. L., Riechers, D., Scoville, N. Z., et al. 2011, *Nature*, 470, 233
- Casey, C. M., Chapman, S. C., Beswick, R. J., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 399, 121
- Casey, C. M. 2012, *MNRAS*, 425, 3094
- Casey, C. M., Berta, S., Béthermin, M., et al. 2012a, *ApJ*, 761, 139
- Casey, C. M., Berta, S., Béthermin, M., et al. 2012b, *ApJ*, 761, 140
- Casey, C. M., Chen, C.-C., Cowie, L. L., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 436, 1919
- Casey, C. M., Narayanan, D., & Cooray, A. 2014, *Phys. Rep.*, 541, 45
- Chapin, E. L., Pope, A., Scott, D., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 398, 1793
- Chapman, S. C. et al. 2003, *ApJ*, 588, 186
- Chapman, S. C. et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 622, 772
- Chapman, S. C. et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, L13
- Chary, R. and Elbaz, D. 2001, *ApJ*, 556, 562
- Condon, J. J. 1992, *ARA&A*, 30, 575
- Coppin, K. E. K., Smail, I., Alexander, D. M., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 395, 1905
- Daddi, E., Dannerbauer, H., Krips, M., et al. 2009a, *ApJ*, 695, L176
- Daddi, E., Dannerbauer, H., Stern, D., et al. 2009b, *ApJ*, 694, 1517
- Del Moro, A., Alexander, D. M., Mullaney, J. R., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 549, AA59
- Dekel, A., Birnboim, Y., Engel, G., et al. 2009, *Nature*, 457, 451
- Dowell, C. D., Conley, A., Glenn, J., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 780, 75
- Downes, A. J. B., Peacock, J. A., Savage, A., & Carrie, D. R. 1986, *MNRAS*, 218, 31
- Elbaz, D., Hwang, H. S., Magnelli, B., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L29
- Elbaz, D. et al. 2011, *A&A*, 533, A119
- Geach, J. E., Chapin, E. L., Coppin, K. E. K., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 432, 53
- Greve, T. R., Pope, A., Scott, D., et al. 2008, *MNRAS*, 389, 1489
- Heinis, S., Buat, V., Béthermin, M., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 437, 1268
- Huang, J.-S., Rigopoulou, D., Magdis, G., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 52
- Hwang, H. S., Elbaz, D., Magdis, G., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, 75
- Ivison, R. J. et al. 2010a, *MNRAS*, 402, 245
- Ivison, R. J. et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 660, L77
- Ivison, R. J. et al. 2010b, *A&A*, 518, L31
- Kartalteppe, J. S., Dickinson, M., Alexander, D. M., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 757, 23
- Kennicutt, Jr., R. C. 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 541
- Koprowski, M. P., Dunlop, J. S., Michałowski, M. J., Cirasuolo, M., & Bowler, R. A. A. 2014, *MNRAS*, 444, 117
- Kovács, A., Chapman, S. C., Dowell, C. D., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 650, 592
- Lagache, G., Puget, J.-L., & Dole, H. 2005, *ARA&A*, 43, 727
- Leiton, R., Elbaz, D., Okumura, K., et al. 2015, *arXiv:1503.05779*
- Le Floc'h, E., Aussel, H., Ilbert, O., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 703, 222
- Lutz, D. 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 373
- Madau, P., & Dickinson, M. 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 415
- Magdis, G. E., Elbaz, D., Hwang, H. S., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, 22
- Magdis, G. E., Elbaz, D., Dickinson, M., et al. 2011, *A&A*, 534, A15
- Magdis, G. E., Daddi, E., Béthermin, M., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 760, 6
- Magnelli, B., Elbaz, D., Chary, R. R., et al. 2009, *A&A*, 496, 57
- Magnelli, B. et al. 2012, *A&A*, 539(155).
- Magnelli, B., Lutz, D., Berta, S., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L28
- Magnelli, B., Popesso, P., Berta, S., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 553, A132
- Magnelli, B., Ivison, R. J., Lutz, D., et al. 2014, *arXiv:1410.7412*
- Michałowski, M., Hjorth, J., & Watson, D. 2010a, *A&A*, 514, A67
- Michałowski, M. J., Watson, D., & Hjorth, J. 2010b, *ApJ*, 712, 942
- Michałowski, M. J., Dunlop, J. S., Ivison, R. J., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, 1845
- Miettinen, O., Smolčić, V., Novak, M., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 577, A29
- Morrison, G. E., Owen, F. N., Dickinson, M., Ivison, R. J., & Ibar, E. 2010, *ApJS*, 188, 178
- Nguyen, H. T., Schulz, B., Levenson, L., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L5
- Oliver, S. J., Bock, J., Altieri, B., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 424, 1614
- Pannella, M., Elbaz, D., Daddi, E., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 807, 141
- Peng, C. Y., Ho, L. C., Impey, C. D., & Rix, H.-W. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 266
- Perera, T. A., Chapin, E. L., Austermann, J. E., et al. 2008, *MNRAS*, 391, 1227
- Polletta, M., Tajer, M., Maraschi, L., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 663, 81
- Pope, A., Borys, C., Scott, D., et al. 2005, *MNRAS*, 358, 149
- Pope, A., Scott, D., Dickinson, M., et al. 2006, *MNRAS*, 370, 1185
- Pope, A., & Chary, R.-R. 2010, *ApJ*, 715, L171
- Rex, M., Rawle, T. D., Egami, E., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L13
- Riechers, D. A., Bradford, C. M., Clements, D. L., et al. 2013, *Nature*, 496, 329
- Roseboom, I. G. et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, 48
- Roseboom, I. G., Ivison, R. J., Greve, T. R., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 419, 2758
- Roseboom, I. G., Dunlop, J. S., Cirasuolo, M., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 436, 430
- Sanders, D. B., & Mirabel, I. F. 1996, *ARA&A*, 34, 749
- Sargent, M. T., Schinnerer, E., Murphy, E., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 714, L190
- Schreiber, C., Pannella, M., Elbaz, D., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 575, A74
- Smolčić, V., Navarrete, F., Aravena, M., et al. 2012a, *ApJS*, 200, 10
- Smolčić, V., Aravena, M., Navarrete, F., et al. 2012b, *A&A*, 548, A4
- Smolčić, V., Karim, A., Miettinen, O., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 576, A127
- Swinbank, A. M., Lacey, C. G., Smail, I., et al. 2008, *MNRAS*, 391, 420
- Swinbank, A. M., Simpson, J. M., Smail, I., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 438, 1267
- Symeonidis, M., Vaccari, M., Berta, S., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 431, 2317
- Targett, T. A., Dunlop, J. S., Cirasuolo, M., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 432, 2012
- Thomson, A. P., Ivison, R. J., Simpson, J. M., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 442, 577
- Vieira, J. D., Marrone, D. P., Chapman, S. C., et al. 2013, *Nature*, 495, 344
- Wall, J. V., Pope, A., & Scott, D. 2008, *MNRAS*, 383, 435
- Walter, F., Decarli, R., Carilli, C., et al. 2012, *Nature*, 486, 233
- Wang, W.-H., Cowie, L. L., van Sadlers, J., Barger, A. J., & Williams, J. P. 2007, *ApJ*, 670, L89
- Wang, W.-H., Barger, A. J., & Cowie, L. L. 2009, *ApJ*, 690, 319
- Wardlow, J. L. et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 1479
- Wardlow, J. L., Cooray, A., De Bernardis, F., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 762, 59
- Weiß, A., De Breuck, C., Marrone, D. P., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 767, 88

- Whitaker, K. E., Kriek, M., van Dokkum, P. G. et al. 2012, ApJ, 745, 179
- Yan, H., Stefanon, M., Ma, Z., et al. 2014, ApJS, 213, 2
- Yun, M. S., Scott, K. S., Guo, Y., et al. 2012, MNRAS, 420, 957
- Younger, J. D., Fazio, G. G., Huang, J.-S., et al. 2007, ApJ, 671, 1531
- Younger, J. D., Fazio, G. G., Huang, J.-S., et al. 2009, ApJ, 704, 803



TABLE 1  
24 $\mu$ m IDENTIFICATIONS OF HERSCHEL 500 $\mu$ m SOURCES IN THE GOODS-NORTH FIELD

Name	RA <sub>24<math>\mu</math>m</sub> (J2000)	Dec <sub>24<math>\mu</math>m</sub> (J2000)	$z_{\text{phot}}$	$z_{\text{spec}}$	Dist. (arcsec)	$P_{24\mu\text{m}}^C$	$P_{3.6\mu\text{m}}^C$	$P_{1.4\text{GHz}}$	$S_{3.6\mu\text{m}}$ ( $\mu\text{Jy}$ )	$S_{5.8\mu\text{m}}$ ( $\mu\text{Jy}$ )
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
GH500.01*	12:35:39.50	62:13:11.9	4.24	...	2.9	...	0.0098	...	6.6 $\pm$ 0.3	19.9 $\pm$ 1.4
GH500.02	12:35:39.54	62:12:43.8	3.03	...	0.9	0.057	0.047	...	7.5 $\pm$ 0.2	14.4 $\pm$ 1.1
GH500.03	12:35:53.12	62:10:37.2	1.53	1.60	9.7	0.081	0.079	0.13	91.5 $\pm$ 0.3	100.8 $\pm$ 1.0
GH500.04	12:35:54.28	62:13:43.5	3.2	...	6.7	0.018	0.022	0.109	9.6 $\pm$ 0.1	18.0 $\pm$ 0.6
	12:35:53.24	62:13:37.5	2.8	...	3.4	0.093	0.069	0.068	6.6 $\pm$ 0.2	9.5 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.05	12:36:05.68	62:08:38.4	3.21	...	8.6	0.053	0.085	...	4.5 $\pm$ 0.1	6.3 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.06†	12:36:08.81	62:11:43.7	1.31	1.33	7.1	0.173	0.167	0.056	79.7 $\pm$ 0.4	64.2 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.07†	12:36:08.60	62:14:35.37	2.15	...	6.1	0.228	0.212	0.086	5.1 $\pm$ 0.1	10.6 $\pm$ 0.4
GH500.08	12:36:08.84	62:08:04.1	3.56	...	2.4	0.0087	0.0088	...	10.0 $\pm$ 0.2	23.8 $\pm$ 0.6
	12:36:10.59	62:08:10.7	4.54	...	11.8	0.0033	0.033	0.04	2.5 $\pm$ 0.2	2.4 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.09	12:36:16.11	62:15:13.7	2.70	2.57	1.4	0.028	0.118	0.05	10.5 $\pm$ 0.2	23.4 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.10	12:36:16.51	62:07:03.0	3.07	...	6.7	0.0076	0.014	0.13	24.6 $\pm$ 0.6	44.1 $\pm$ 0.9
	12:36:15.61	62:06:43.1	4.09	...	14.1	0.016	0.023	0.07	2.9 $\pm$ 0.2	5.2 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.11	12:36:18.49	62:09:03.3	1.61	...	0.15	0.061	0.061	...	57.7 $\pm$ 0.2	56.8 $\pm$ 0.7
GH500.12	12:36:18.39	62:15:50.6	1.90	2.0	2.3	0.079	0.056	0.011	16.2 $\pm$ 0.2	31.3 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.13	12:36:20.98	62:17:09.8	1.49	1.99	2.5	0.067	0.151	0.055	14.9 $\pm$ 0.1	23.5 $\pm$ 0.3
	12:36:21.27	62:17:08.2	2.32	...	0.91	0.205	0.075	0.010	13.8 $\pm$ 0.1	24.6 $\pm$ 0.4
GH500.14	12:36:22.66	62:16:29.7	1.92	2.47	7.2	0.024	0.266	0.03	19.9 $\pm$ 0.3	35.7 $\pm$ 0.9
	12:36:22.07	62:16:15.9	4.63	...	7.4	0.0033	0.005	0.12	3.4 $\pm$ 0.2	11.2 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.15*	12:36:27.19	62:06:05.4	4.4	...	7.2	...	0.014	0.11	1.9 $\pm$ 0.2	5.1 $\pm$ 0.7
GH500.16†	12:36:31.29	62:09:58.0	2.02	...	1.7	0.11	0.219	0.014	13.2 $\pm$ 0.2	20.9 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.17†	12:36:32.65	62:06:21.1	2.91	...	9.1	...	0.226	0.13	3.6 $\pm$ 0.1	9.5 $\pm$ 0.4
	12:36:34.53	62:06:13.1	4.31	...	11.3	...	0.055	...	2.1 $\pm$ 0.2	2.5 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.18	12:36:33.40	62:14:08.5	...	4.04	1.7	0.022	0.042	0.089	0.5 $\pm$ 0.1	1.4 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.19	12:36:44.03	62:19:38.4	3.41	...	6.9	0.035	0.029	0.123	2.3 $\pm$ 0.09	6.9 $\pm$ 1.1
GH500.20	12:36:46.07	62:14:48.9	2.67	...	2.6	0.062	0.121	0.02	7.9 $\pm$ 0.2	14.1 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.21	12:37:00.26	62:09:09.9	2.13	...	12.5	0.077	0.075	0.004	22.1 $\pm$ 0.2	40.8 $\pm$ 0.7
GH500.22	12:37:00.96	62:11:45.6	2.01	1.76	3.92	0.036	0.058	0.022	61.5 $\pm$ 0.2	79.5 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.23	12:37:01.52	62:20:24.8	3.00	...	0.39	0.060	0.038	0.049	8.7 $\pm$ 0.2	17.4 $\pm$ 0.6
	12:37:02.12	62:20:24.9	5.92	...	3.81	...	0.001	...	1.1 $\pm$ 0.2	1.2 $\pm$ 0.4
GH500.24†	12:37:01.10	62:21:09.6	0.79	0.8	7.9	0.87	0.316	0.005	239.8 $\pm$ 0.6	118.0 $\pm$ 1.2
GH500.25	12:37:02.55	62:13:02.3	4.44	...	2.2	0.003	0.007	0.12	3.9 $\pm$ 0.08	8.3 $\pm$ 0.3
	12:37:02.90	62:13:07.0	4.49	...	7.5	...	0.039	...	1.5 $\pm$ 0.08	2.4 $\pm$ 0.3
GH500.26	12:37:07.21	62:14:08.2	2.45	2.48	1.1	0.048	0.059	0.12	17.6 $\pm$ 0.1	28.4 $\pm$ 0.6
	12:37:07.58	62:14:09.5	5.1	2.48	3.9	0.149	0.018	0.10	24.1 $\pm$ 0.3	51.5 $\pm$ 0.8
GH500.27	12:37:11.81	62:22:12.3	4.16	4.04	8.6	0.0087	0.015	0.046	8.3 $\pm$ 0.2	19.7 $\pm$ 1.0
	12:37:09.73	62:22:02.3	4.10	4.04	9.1	0.022	0.014	0.139	7.5 $\pm$ 0.3	16.8 $\pm$ 0.9
	12:37:08.73	62:22:02.5	4.39	...	13.4	0.015	0.028	...	4.4 $\pm$ 0.2	3.5 $\pm$ 0.4
	12:37:08.78	62:22:01.8	4.19	4.04	14.7	0.021	0.025	0.014	4.0 $\pm$ 0.09	4.2 $\pm$ 0.4
	12:37:09.42	62:22:14.5	1.65	1.63	11.4	0.187	0.049	0.127	57.2 $\pm$ 0.2	68.2 $\pm$ 0.9
GH500.28	12:37:11.37	62:13:31.0	1.79	1.99	1.6	0.043	0.056	0.02	54.8 $\pm$ 0.1	72.9 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.29	12:37:12.05	62:12:12.0	2.86	2.91	7.3	0.076	0.046	0.10	9.2 $\pm$ 0.09	17.9 $\pm$ 0.5
	12:37:14.29	62:12:08.5	2.2	3.15	9.3	0.013	0.063	...	17.5 $\pm$ 0.1	26.3 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.30	12:37:13.86	62:18:26.3	4.15	...	2.1	0.010	0.011	0.003	4.4 $\pm$ 0.09	10.6 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.31	12:37:28.08	62:19:20.2	4.32	...	2.3	0.0087	0.0033	0.11	7.7 $\pm$ 0.4	16.2 $\pm$ 1.6
	12:37:29.24	62:19:28.6	4.65	...	12.89	...	0.025	...	2.9 $\pm$ 0.2	4.2 $\pm$ 0.3
GH500.32	12:37:28.11	62:14:21.82	3.32	...	5.06	0.047	0.071	...	1.8 $\pm$ 0.08	4.7 $\pm$ 0.6
GH500.33	12:37:30.78	62:12:58.9	2.41	...	0.9	0.071	0.102	0.017	17.1 $\pm$ 0.9	17.7 $\pm$ 2.3
GH500.34	12:37:38.30	62:17:36.2	3.13	3.19	1.5	0.059	0.193	0.13	4.3 $\pm$ 0.2	8.6 $\pm$ 0.8
	12:37:39.37	62:17:35.0	4.33	...	7.69	...	0.023	...	4.1 $\pm$ 0.6	3.6 $\pm$ 0.9
GH500.35	12:38:00.27	62:16:21.2	2.4	...	4.6	0.085	0.045	...	14.4 $\pm$ 0.3	28.2 $\pm$ 0.7
	12:38:00.84	62:16:11.8	2.19	...	6.5	0.094	0.051	...	40.0 $\pm$ 0.2	48.3 $\pm$ 0.8
	12:37:58.82	62:16:11.7	1.98	...	10.6	0.096	0.119	...	10.2 $\pm$ 0.1	19.7 $\pm$ 0.5
GH500.36†	12:38:12.54	62:14:54.3	0.60	...	3.8	0.307	0.638	0.059	126.5 $\pm$ 0.6	116.4 $\pm$ 2.7

NOTE. — Column (1): Name; (2) & (3): coordinates for the 24 $\mu$ m counterparts; (4): Photometric redshift; (5): Spectroscopic redshift from Barger et al. (2008); Daddi et al. (2009a,b); (6): Distance of the 24 $\mu$ m counterparts from the center of source in the ratio map; (7): Probability  $P$  for random associations of 24 $\mu$ m counterparts is calculated as  $P = 1 - \exp[-\pi n \theta^2]$ , where  $n$  is the surface density of sources brighter than the predicted 500 $\mu$ m flux,  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}^{\text{Pred}}$ , and with redshifts above  $z$  for a given counterpart of interest (see Section 2.3.2). (8):  $P$ -values for candidate counterparts from the IRAC 3.6 $\mu$ m catalog, which are calculated similar to the 24 $\mu$ m catalog, but using the main-sequence relation to predict 500 $\mu$ m flux from stellar masses. (9):  $P$ -values for the radio 1.4 GHz catalogue, but are calculated using  $n_{(>S)}$  (the surface density of sources brighter than radio flux  $S_{1.4\text{GHz}}$ ). Traditionally, a radio counterpart is considered to be robust with  $P < 0.05$ . \*Counterpart(s) identified from the IRAC 3.6 $\mu$ m. †Counterpart(s) identified based on the radio 1.4GHz detection.

TABLE 2  
OBSERVED PHOTOMETRY FOR HERSCHEL-SELECTED DUST OBSCURED STAR-FORMING GALAXIES

Name	RA	Dec	$z$	24 $\mu$ m ( $\mu$ Jy)	100 $\mu$ m (mJy)	160 $\mu$ m (mJy)	250 $\mu$ m (mJy)	350 $\mu$ m (mJy)	500 $\mu$ m (mJy)	850 $\mu$ m (mJy)	1.1mm (mJy)	1.4GHz ( $\mu$ Jy)	$L_{\text{FIR}}$ $10^{12}L_{\odot}$	$T_{\text{dust}}$ (K)
GH500.1	12:35:39.49	62:13:11.7	4.24	...	...	...	5.6 $\pm$ 2.3	9.3 $\pm$ 2.1	14.9 $\pm$ 3.9	...	...	...	6.1	27.8 $\pm$ 8.8
GH500.2	12:35:39.60	62:12:44.6	3.03	54.2 $\pm$ 6.8	...	4.2 $\pm$ 1.0	7.8 $\pm$ 2.1	10.7 $\pm$ 2.7	10.6 $\pm$ 4.1	...	2.0	...	3.5	31.5 $\pm$ 4.5
GH500.4a	12:35:54.28	62:13:43.5	3.2	149.9 $\pm$ 8.1	1.1 $\pm$ 0.3	2.8 $\pm$ 0.9	12.7 $\pm$ 2.2	17.3 $\pm$ 2.3	12.6 $\pm$ 3.9	<13.8	3.1 $\pm$ 1.1	28.9 $\pm$ 12.1	5.4	30.7 $\pm$ 4.8
GH500.4b	12:35:53.28	62:13:37.6	2.81	32.5 $\pm$ 6.6	...	3.3 $\pm$ 0.9	20.6 $\pm$ 2.2	23.2 $\pm$ 2.3	15.6 $\pm$ 3.9	<6.4	...	39.8 $\pm$ 4.5	6.5	34.5 $\pm$ 8.1
GH500.5	12:36:05.68	62:08:38.5	3.2	37.47 $\pm$ 6.6	...	...	6.7 $\pm$ 2.1	10.2 $\pm$ 2.6	11.0 $\pm$ 3.9	<10.5	...	...	3.3	28.4 $\pm$ 9.9
GH500.7 <sup>†</sup>	12:36:08.57	62:14:35.3	2.15	55.1 $\pm$ 6.7	...	3.1 $\pm$ 0.9	10.1 $\pm$ 2.2	11.9 $\pm$ 2.4	9.7 $\pm$ 3.4*	4.9 $\pm$ 2.3	2.4 $\pm$ 1.2	22.1 $\pm$ 7.1	1.51	23.8 $\pm$ 2.9
GH500.8	12:36:08.84	62:08:04.0	3.56	151.2 $\pm$ 8.2	...	3.5 $\pm$ 1.0	9.3 $\pm$ 2.1	10.2 $\pm$ 2.7	11.0 $\pm$ 4.0	<9.3	...	...	6.1	35.2 $\pm$ 7.3
GH500.9	12:36:16.116	62:15:13.7	2.57*	322.5 $\pm$ 10.	5.7 $\pm$ 4.1	12.0 $\pm$ 4.1	28.4 $\pm$ 2.1	29.0 $\pm$ 2.4	16.2 $\pm$ 4.2	4.9 $\pm$ 0.7	2.9 $\pm$ 1.1	35.8 $\pm$ 4.9	8.4	37.7 $\pm$ 1.6
GH500.10a	12:36:15.7	62:06:43.1	4.09	45.3 $\pm$ 6.7	...	4.2 $\pm$ 1.0	9.3 $\pm$ 2.0	9.8 $\pm$ 2.8	11.5 $\pm$ 4.1	<8.7	...	43.5 $\pm$ 5.8	9.0	41.0 $\pm$ 8.3
GH500.10b	12:36:16.51	62:07:03.0	3.07	302.4 $\pm$ 10	3.1 $\pm$ 4.1	...	21.6 $\pm$ 2.0	27.5 $\pm$ 2.8	17.2 $\pm$ 4.1	<12	...	26 $\pm$ 4.7	8.5	33.8 $\pm$ 4.9
GH500.12	12:36:18.31	62:15:50.5	2.0*	314.5 $\pm$ 10.	4.3 $\pm$ 0.4	23.4 $\pm$ 1.1	42.8 $\pm$ 2.3	47.1 $\pm$ 2.1	23.6 $\pm$ 4.0	7.5 $\pm$ 0.9	1.9 $\pm$ 1.1	164.4 $\pm$ 6.9	4.7	29.8 $\pm$ 1.2
GH500.13	12:36:20.96	62:17:10.0	1.99*	361.3 $\pm$ 10	3.98 $\pm$ 0.4	15.3 $\pm$ 1.0	21.6 $\pm$ 2.0	26.4 $\pm$ 2.6	13.7 $\pm$ 4.1	3.5 $\pm$ 0.7	...	44.9 $\pm$ 2.7	3.6	31.0 $\pm$ 1.7
GH500.14a	12:36:22.66	62:16:29.70	2.47*	412.8 $\pm$ 11	3.9 $\pm$ 0.4	12.3 $\pm$ 0.9	23.7 $\pm$ 2.0	21.2 $\pm$ 2.5	13.9 $\pm$ 4.2	<3.4	...	91.6 $\pm$ 9.9	5.8	33.3 $\pm$ 2.5
GH500.14b	12:36:22.10	62:16:15.9	4.63	50.4 $\pm$ 6.8	...	...	8.3 $\pm$ 2.0	16.0 $\pm$ 2.5	14.3 $\pm$ 4.2	9.3 $\pm$ 1.4	...	26.1 $\pm$ 6.1	11.2	33.7 $\pm$ 3.5
GH500.15	12:36:27.23	62:06:05.7	4.4 <sup>‡</sup>	...	...	...	7.3 $\pm$ 2.0	14.5 $\pm$ 2.8	13.7 $\pm$ 4.2	9.5 $\pm$ 2.3	4.3 $\pm$ 1.1	34.3 $\pm$ 5.9	10.0	35.2 $\pm$ 5.2
GH500.16	12:36:31.23	62:09:57.7	2.02	209.4 $\pm$ 8.3	4.9 $\pm$ 3.9	16.1 $\pm$ 1.0	25.6 $\pm$ 2.0	23.5 $\pm$ 2.7	14.8 $\pm$ 4.2	3.7 $\pm$ 0.8	...	141 $\pm$ 6.1	3.7	32.6 $\pm$ 1.6
GH500.17	12:36:32.65	62:06:21.1	2.91	...	...	...	13.6 $\pm$ 2.0	19.5 $\pm$ 2.7	17.5 $\pm$ 3.2*	<25.5	3.1 $\pm$ 1.1	23.8 $\pm$ 4.3	5.1	30.5 $\pm$ 5.4
GH500.18	12:36:33.42	62:14:08.7	4.04*	30.4 $\pm$ 6.6	...	...	8.2 $\pm$ 2.2	14.3 $\pm$ 2.7	13.2 $\pm$ 4.2	10.5 $\pm$ 1.6	5.4 $\pm$ 0.9	34.0 $\pm$ 4.0	8.1	29.1 $\pm$ 2.8
GH500.19	12:36:44.02	62:19:38.4	3.41	34.9 $\pm$ 6.5	...	...	11.9 $\pm$ 2.0	14.7 $\pm$ 2.8	13.1 $\pm$ 4.1	5.66 $\pm$ 0.97	2.3 $\pm$ 1.1	25.4 $\pm$ 2.9	6.5	31.0 $\pm$ 3.3
GH500.20	12:36:46.04	62:14:48.6	2.67	129.8 $\pm$ 8.4	3.9 $\pm$ 0.4	16.6 $\pm$ 1.0	25.9 $\pm$ 2.0	24.9 $\pm$ 2.6	21.1 $\pm$ 4.1	5.4 $\pm$ 0.5	...	109.6 $\pm$ 5.3	7.6	37.4 $\pm$ 1.5
GH500.21	12:37:00.26	62:09:09.9	2.13	246.9 $\pm$ 9.1	2.0 $\pm$ 0.4	6.6 $\pm$ 0.9	16.8 $\pm$ 1.9	16.6 $\pm$ 2.8	13.0 $\pm$ 4.2	3.5 $\pm$ 0.8	...	337.5 $\pm$ 4.3	2.7	34.4 $\pm$ 2.2
GH500.23	12:37:01.57	62:20:24.9	3.0	55.7 $\pm$ 6.6	...	3.1 $\pm$ 0.9	10.4 $\pm$ 2.0	13.8 $\pm$ 2.8	7.7 $\pm$ 3.9*	<8.1	...	48.1 $\pm$ 5.1	4.2	29.8 $\pm$ 6.3
GH500.25	12:37:02.55	62:13:02.3	4.44	79.0 $\pm$ 7.6	0.9 $\pm$ 0.3	6.0 $\pm$ 0.9	11.9 $\pm$ 2.0	11.6 $\pm$ 2.7	5.2 $\pm$ 2.7	3.2 $\pm$ 0.6	...	25.3 $\pm$ 4.0	10.7	50.8 $\pm$ 5.8
GH500.26	12:37:07.18	62:14:08.2	2.49*	248.9 $\pm$ 9.1	1.6 $\pm$ 0.4	8.6 $\pm$ 0.9	23.9 $\pm$ 2.0	29.0 $\pm$ 2.4	24.7 $\pm$ 4.1	7.6 $\pm$ 0.6	...	28.3 $\pm$ 4.2	5.2	29.7 $\pm$ 1.4
GH500.27a	12:37:11.89	62:22:11.8	4.05*	84.3 $\pm$ 7.8	...	6.1 $\pm$ 0.9	17.3 $\pm$ 1.9	30.1 $\pm$ 2.3	46.6 $\pm$ 4.1	20.3 $\pm$ 2.1	10.7 $\pm$ 9.4	79.3 $\pm$ 13.	18.0	32.3 $\pm$ 1.6
GH500.27b	12:37:09.73	62:22:02.5	4.055*	30.2 $\pm$ 6.6	...	2.9 $\pm$ 0.9	12.4 $\pm$ 2.0	15.2 $\pm$ 2.4	18.2 $\pm$ 4.0	...	...	19.9 $\pm$ 4.0	8.5	33.9 $\pm$ 5.5
GH500.27c	12:37:08.77	62:22:01.7	4.055*	38.8 $\pm$ 6.5	...	...	14.5 $\pm$ 2.0	18.0 $\pm$ 2.4	18.2 $\pm$ 4.0	9.9 $\pm$ 2.3	...	172.9 $\pm$ 9.0	10.2	36.5 $\pm$ 5.5
GH500.28	12:37:11.37	62:13:31.0	1.99*	748.0 $\pm$ 15.9	11.3 $\pm$ 0.6	34.9 $\pm$ 1.5	54.1 $\pm$ 2.8	49.3 $\pm$ 2.1	29.2 $\pm$ 3.9	7.7 $\pm$ 0.6	4.0 $\pm$ 1.0	178.9 $\pm$ 12.1	8.7	33.1 $\pm$ 0.9
GH500.29	12:37:12.04	62:12:11.7	2.91*	51.5 $\pm$ 6.7	1.0 $\pm$ 0.3	3.6 $\pm$ 1.0	11.8 $\pm$ 2.0	10.0 $\pm$ 2.6	6.5 $\pm$ 4.0*	4.6 $\pm$ 0.7	2.0 $\pm$ 1.0	31.7 $\pm$ 4.3	3.6	31.9 $\pm$ 3.3
GH500.30	12:37:13.86	62:18:26.2	4.15	63.4 $\pm$ 7.0	1.08 $\pm$ 0.4	3.5 $\pm$ 1.0	10.6 $\pm$ 2.0	12.5 $\pm$ 2.8	7.3 $\pm$ 3.2*	4.5 $\pm$ 0.8	2.4 $\pm$ 1.1	627 $\pm$ 8	7.8	41.4 $\pm$ 5.1
GH500.31	12:37:28.09	62:19:20.1	4.32	44.1 $\pm$ 6.8	...	2.2 $\pm$ 0.8	12.3 $\pm$ 2.0	13.8 $\pm$ 2.9	13.4 $\pm$ 4.2	<6.9	...	33.6 $\pm$ 5.4	10.1	36.7 $\pm$ 7.8
GH500.32	12:37:28.11	62:14:21.82	3.32	34.3 $\pm$ 6.6	...	2.0 $\pm$ 0.8	21.1 $\pm$ 2.0	21.7 $\pm$ 2.7	20.7 $\pm$ 4.0	<8.4	...	...	6.9	29.5 $\pm$ 3.8
GH500.33 <sup>†</sup>	12:37:30.78	62:12:58.7	2.41	184 $\pm$ 7.7	4.9 $\pm$ 0.4	23.4 $\pm$ 1.1	52.3 $\pm$ 2.3	55.0 $\pm$ 2.1	44.8 $\pm$ 3.8	12.21 $\pm$ 0.77	4.1 $\pm$ 1.1	114 $\pm$ 7	9.3	28.3 $\pm$ 0.9
GH500.34	12:37:38.15	62:17:37.1	3.19*	39.3 $\pm$ 6.6	...	...	9.6 $\pm$ 2.1	12.4 $\pm$ 2.8	7.3 $\pm$ 3.2*	4.7 $\pm$ 2.3	3.4 $\pm$ 1.0	26.0 $\pm$ 5.9	4.0	28.6 $\pm$ 5.8
GH500.35	12:38:00.27	62:16:21.2	2.4	140.5 $\pm$ 8.3	2.1 $\pm$ 0.4	6.0 $\pm$ 1.0	11.2 $\pm$ 2.1	12.7 $\pm$ 2.8	11.6 $\pm$ 3.6	<10.5	...	...	2.9	32.4 $\pm$ 4.9

NOTE. — <sup>†</sup> IR SED fittings are very poor, thus the inferred far-IR luminosity and dust temperature are highly uncertain. We did not consider the two sources in our analysis. <sup>‡</sup> Redshift from the far-IR SED fit. Although it is likely at high- $z$ , we did not include this source in our analysis. \* Spectroscopic redshift from Barger et al. (2008); Daddi et al. (2009a,b).

## APPENDIX

## A. NOTES ON INDIVIDUAL SOURCES

Here we present detailed notes on individual *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m sources found in the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map. The candidate counterparts in the higher-resolution bands are identified with (modified)  $P$ -statistics (Section 2.3.2 and Table 1).

GH500.1: This is a single 500 $\mu$ m source ( $S_{500\mu\text{m}} \sim 15$  mJy) revealed with the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  method. There are two 24 $\mu$ m sources within the search radius of 15'', but neither has a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1. We therefore searched the *Spitzer*/IRAC catalog for candidate counterparts and identified an IRAC source with photometric redshift  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.24$  as the counterpart based on the  $P$ -statistics. The source is weakly detected in the  $K_s$  band, but appears relatively bright in the *Spitzer*/IRAC bands, strongly suggesting that it is a candidate high- $z$  dusty star-forming galaxy.

GH500.2: There is a single unambiguous 24 $\mu$ m counterpart with photometric redshift of  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.03$ . There is a faint 1.2 mm source (GN 1200.38, Greve et al. 2008) 3 arcsec away from the 24 $\mu$ m position. The source is not detected in the radio or other submm bands.

GH500.3: There are seven 24 $\mu$ m sources within the search radius, but  $P$ -statistics suggest that a  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.6$  source is the likely counterpart to the 500 $\mu$ m source that is detected in the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map. The source is also detected in the radio.

GH500.4: There are five 24 $\mu$ m sources within the search radius, but only two of them, one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.2$  and another at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.81$ , have a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1. While both sources are detected in the radio, the one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.2$  is also identified as the counterpart to a 1.1mm source (AzGN13, Chapin et al. 2009). The *Herschel* flux in the official GOODS-*Herschel* catalog (Elbaz et al. 2011) was given to a nearby  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.98$  source. By fitting its far-IR photometry with a suite of CE01 templates, we found that there is a significant excess of SPIRE flux compared to that predicted from the best template, suggesting that it is likely a wrong association.

GH500.5: There are four 24 $\mu$ m sources within the search radius, but only the one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.2$  has a high probability to be associated with the 500 $\mu$ m emission. The source is not detected in the radio 1.4 GHz and other submm bands.

GH500.6: There is no source in the 24 $\mu$ m and IRAC 3.6 $\mu$ m catalog with a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1. Therefore, we searched for a candidate counterpart in the radio 1.4 GHz catalog. There are two radio sources within the search radius, one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.54$  and another at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.33$ . Since the latter has a much lower probability ( $P_{1.4\text{GHz}}=0.056$ ) of being a chance association, we consider it as the probable counterpart. This source is also identified as the counterpart to the SCUBA 850 $\mu$ m emission (GN02, Pope et al. 2006).

GH500.7: Like GH500.6, there is no source in the 24 $\mu$ m and IRAC 3.6 $\mu$ m catalog with a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1. The candidate counterpart is therefore identified from the radio 1.4 GHz catalog with a photometric redshift  $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.15$ . The source is also identified as the counterpart to the SCUBA source GN 23 by Pope et al. (2006). Nevertheless, we found that the fit with  $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.15$  to the far-IR photometric data is poor ( $\chi^2=12.5$ ) and there is a significant excess of emission above 250 $\mu$ m compared to the best-fit template. Allowing the redshift to vary in the fit, we found a much better fit at  $z = 3.2$  ( $\chi^2=0.49$ ). Either its photometric redshift was wrong, or it has extremely cold SED that was not included in the CE01 libraries. The source is also listed in the SCUBA-2 catalog with source name CDFN43, and the 1.1 mm catalog (ID AzGN24), for which the same identification was proposed. Note that the *Herschel* flux in the official GOODS-*Herschel* catalog was assigned to a nearby  $z = 1.46$  source, which may suggest severe blending of *Herschel* flux from multiple counterparts.

GH500.8: There are three 24 $\mu$ m sources within the search radius, and two of them have low  $P$ -values, with one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.56$  and another at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.54$ . Although the latter is significantly detected at 1.4 GHz, it is further away from the 500 $\mu$ m source centroid ( $\sim 10''$ ). Our careful flux decomposition suggests that the source has little contribution to the 500 $\mu$ m emission ( $\sim 15\%$ ). The strong radio emission is likely associated with an AGN. We therefore considered the  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.56$  as the most probable counterpart to the 500 $\mu$ m source ( $S_{500\mu\text{m}}=11$  mJy).

GH500.9: There are two heavily blended 24 $\mu$ m sources within the search radius, one has a spectroscopic redshift of  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.99$  and the other has  $z_{\text{spec}} = 2.578$  (CDFN29, Barger et al. 2014). The latter has a radio detection and a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1, thus was chosen as counterpart. Barger et al. (2014) also identified it as the counterpart to the 850 $\mu$ m emission (CDFN29, also known as GN04). Since the blending is an issue, there may be a large uncertainty in the 500 $\mu$ m flux.

GH500.10: There are five 24 $\mu$ m sources in the search radius, but only two of them have a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1. While both sources are also detected in the radio, neither is detected in the other submm bands.

GH500.11: Like GH500.9, there are two heavily blended 24 $\mu$ m sources within the search radius, one has a redshift of  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.99$  and the other has  $z_{\text{phot}} = 1.61$ . The latter has a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1, thus was chosen as



the counterpart.

GH500.12: There are five  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius, but only one of them has a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1, with a spectroscopic redshift of  $z_{\text{spec}} = 2.0$ . The source is also identified as the counterpart to the SCUBA-2  $850\mu\text{m}$  emission based on its strong radio emission (CDFN14, Barger et al. 2014). The source is also known as a submm source 850-9 (Barger et al. 2012) or GN 19 (Pope et al. 2006).

GH500.13: There are five  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius, but only two of them are identified as candidate counterparts based on the  $P$ -statistics, with one at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.99$  and another at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.32$ . Both sources are also detected in the radio, but separated by only  $2.7''$ , with the latter (CDFN34, Barger et al. 2014) being four times brighter than the former. While the two sources cannot be resolved by SCUBA (GN7, Pope et al. 2006), Barger et al. presented higher-resolution SMA measurements, separating it into two distinct sources, each with an  $860\mu\text{m}$  flux of  $\sim 3.5$  mJy. As it is impossible to deconvolve the *Herschel* flux, we report the total flux of the two.

GH500.14: Like GH500.13, there are five  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius, but only two of them are considered as candidate counterparts. Both sources are detected in the radio, with one being four times brighter than the other. The brighter radio source has a spectroscopic redshift of 2.47, while the fainter one has a photometric redshift of  $z = 4.63$ . Barger et al. (2014) measured the SCUBA-2  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux of  $5.2 \pm 0.7$  mJy for the fainter radio source (CDFN21, also known as GN9). Because of their close separation ( $<10''$ ), the SPIRE flux density from the *Herschel* catalog is given to the  $z_{\text{spec}} = 2.46$ , brighter  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart.

GH500.15: This source is a  $24\mu\text{m}$  dropout galaxy, but detected in the AzTEC 1.1 mm Survey of the GOODS-N field (AzGN06, Perera et al. 2007). It is also listed in the SCUBA-2 sample of  $850\mu\text{m}$  sources (Name: CDFN8,  $S_{850\mu\text{m}} = 9.09$  mJy, Barger et al. 2014). This galaxy is not detected in the  $K_s$  or bluer bands, but is detected in all four *Spitzer*/IRAC bands, suggesting it is a possible candidate at  $z > 4$ . Using the 1.4 GHz to  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux ratio, Barger et al. estimated that the source has a millimetric photometric redshift of 3.7. By fitting its far-IR to radio photometry with a suite of CE01 templates, we found a best-fit redshift of  $z = 4.4$  for the source.

GH500.16: This object has a single and clear radio counterpart, and is also detected with SCUBA-2 at  $850\mu\text{m}$  (Source ID: CDFN39).

GH500.17: There is single  $24\mu\text{m}$  source at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.22$  within the search radius, but the probability of this source being a chance alignment with the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission is high. We therefore searched for candidate counterparts in the IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  catalog, and found a counterpart at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.31$  based on the  $P$ -statistics. By fitting the far-IR photometry with a range of CE01 templates, we found that the fit with  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.22$  is very poor ( $\chi^2 = 192$ ), and the predicted flux based on the best-fitted SED suggests that the source contributes no more than 10% to the measured  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission. Therefore, the  $24\mu\text{m}$  dropout, at a redshift of  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.31$ , is likely to be the dominant  $500\mu\text{m}$  emitter.

GH500.18: This object is part of the Pope et al. (2006) catalog (GN10) and Perera et al. (2008) catalog (AzGN3). Similar to GN20, Daddi et al. (2009a) have identified that it has a spectroscopic redshift of 4.042 from a CO emission line. The source is also listed in the Greve et al. (2008) 1.2 mm catalog and SCUBA-2 catalog. We note that the SPIRE flux densities in the catalog are assigned to a nearby, brighter  $24\mu\text{m}$  source at  $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.45$ . By fitting the far-IR photometry with a range of CE01 templates, we find that the predicted  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission for the  $z = 1.45$  source is less than 20% of that reported in the catalog, suggesting an incorrect association, and that most of the  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux should be associated with GN10.

GH500.19: There are three  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius, but only one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.41$  was identified as a candidate counterpart based on the  $P$ -statistics. It is detected in the AzTEC 1.1 mm imaging by Perera et al. 2007 (source ID: AzGN28), but not in the SCUBA map. New SCUBA-2 imaging reveals that the source has an  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux of  $5.66 \pm 0.97$  mJy (ID: CDFN19, Barger et al. 2014). The SPIRE fluxes in the catalog of Elbaz et al. (2011) were mis-associated with a  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.27$  galaxy, which is  $\sim 10''$  away from the  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.41$  source.

GH500.20: Like GH500.9, there are four heavily blended  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius. Only one source at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.67$  was identified as the candidate counterpart based on the  $P$ -statistics. This source is also known as GN 12 in the Pope et al. (2006) catalog and CDFN20 in the Barger et al. (2014) catalog. Chapin et al. (2009) identified this source as the counterpart to the 1.1mm emission (AzTEC 8), though it is  $\sim 7$  arcsec away from the 1.1mm source centroid.

GH500.21: There are four  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius, two of which are detected in the radio. However, only one object at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.13$  was chosen as a candidate counterpart based on the modified  $P$ -statistics computed from the  $24\mu\text{m}$  catalog. This source is also identified as the counterpart to the  $850\mu\text{m}$  emission (CDFN44 and GN16, Barger et al. 2014).

GH500.22: Like GH500.21, there are five  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius, but only one ( $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.01$ ) is a probable counterpart to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission. This source is also detected in the radio and at  $850\mu\text{m}$  (CDFN22 and GN17, Barger et al. 2014).

GH500.23: Among three  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources, the one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.0$  is identified as a candidate counterpart. There is another IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  source ( $z_{\text{phot}} = 5.9$ ) separated by only  $\sim 4''$ , which possibly contributes to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission, although it is not detected in the  $24\mu\text{m}$  and radio maps.

GH500.24: There are two heavily blended  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius. Though both are detected in the radio map, neither has a modified  $P$ -value less than 0.1 based on the  $24\mu\text{m}$  and IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  catalog. We chose the brighter radio source ( $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.8$ ) as the candidate counterpart.

GH500.25: This source has a single and unambiguous  $24\mu\text{m}$ /radio identification, which is also associated with the SCUBA  $850\mu\text{m}$  emission (GN18, Pope et al. 2006).

GH500.26: This  $500\mu\text{m}$  source appears to have two  $24\mu\text{m}$ /radio counterparts to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux. Nevertheless, both objects are confirmed to have a spectroscopic redshift of 2.484 (Pope et al. 2006), thus the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission comes from two interacting galaxies at the same redshift. While Barger et al. (2014) identified a single counterpart to the  $850\mu\text{m}$  emission (CDFN14), Pope et al. (2006) reported two radio identifications to the SCUBA  $850\mu\text{m}$  emission (GN19).

GH500.27: There are four  $24\mu\text{m}$  identifications to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission, three of them are also known as GN20, GN20a and GN20b. They are associated with a  $z = 4.05$  protocluster in the GOODS-North field (Daddi et al. 2009b), and have spectroscopic redshifts of 4.055 based on CO lines. They are among the brightest submm sources detected with SCUBA. There is another IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  source at a lower redshift ( $z_{\text{spec}} = 1.63$ ) likely contributing to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission, though the probability of random association is relatively high for the  $24\mu\text{m}$  catalog ( $P_{24\mu\text{m}}^C = 0.187$ ).

GH500.28: This object is a significant SCUBA source, GN 39, described in Wall et al. (2008), and has two radio counterparts, both confirmed to lie at the same redshift ( $z_1 = 1.996$  and  $z_2 = 1.992$ , Barger et al. 2008). As the two sources are separated by only  $\sim 6''$ , it is impossible to deconvolve the SPIRE fluxes, and we report the total flux of the two from the *Herschel* catalog.

GH500.29: There are two spectroscopically-confirmed  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources identified as candidate counterparts (one at  $z = 3.2$  and the other at  $z = 2.91$ ). The  $z = 2.91$  source has a radio detection (hence the counterpart identification is secure), and is associated with a submm source at  $850\mu\text{m}$  (CDFN27, Barger et al. 2014) and  $1.2\text{mm}$  (GN1200.29, Greve et al. 2008). The  $z = 3.2$  source is, however, not detected in these (sub)mm bands, but shows a tentative detection in the radio. Deeper radio imaging (Owen et al. in preparation) will help to confirm the counterpart.

GH500.30: The source has a robust identification in the  $24\mu\text{m}$  and radio catalogs, with a photometric redshift of  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.15$ . Note that the source is very bright in the radio ( $S_{1.4\text{GHz}} = 626\mu\text{Jy}$ ) with a strong radio excess ( $q < 1.5$ ), suggesting a significant contribution from an AGN. The source was reported as an additional  $850\mu\text{m}$  source from the Pope et al. (2006) sample with  $S_{850\mu\text{m}} = 8.8\text{ mJy}$  (Wall et al. 2008), and was also detected at  $1.1\text{mm}$  (ID AzGN26, Perera et al. 2007), and  $1.2\text{mm}$  (GN 1200.6, Greve et al. 2008). However, it was later reported in the SCUBA-2 catalog with an  $850\mu\text{m}$  flux of  $4.5\text{ mJy}$  (Name CDFN28, Barger et al. 2014).

GH500.31: A robust and clean  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.3$  galaxy identified with a  $24\mu\text{m}$ /radio counterpart, which is, however, not detected in any submm bands. Although the  $P$ -statistics for the IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  catalog revealed another candidate counterpart at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.6$ , the galaxy is not detected in the radio and is far from the  $500\mu\text{m}$  source centroid, thus its contribution to the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission is marginal.

GH500.32: There are seven heavily blended  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius, but only one at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 3.3$  was identified as a candidate counterpart based on the  $P$ -statistics. The source is not detected in the radio and other submm bands.

GH500.33: The source has a robust and unambiguous counterpart identification the  $24\mu\text{m}$  /radio. The galaxy does not appear in the Pope et al. (2006) catalog (it is at the edge of SCUBA coverage where the sensitivity is low). Barger et al. (2014) reported the significant SCUBA-2  $850\mu\text{m}$  detection of this source (ID: CDFN4) at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 2.41$ , with flux of  $\sim 12\text{ mJy}$ , making it one of the brightest submm sources ( $> 10\text{ mJy}$ ) in their catalog. This source also appears in the  $1.1\text{mm}$  catalog of Perera et al. (2008), known as AzGN05.

GH500.34: The galaxy has a robust identification in the radio and  $24\mu\text{m}$  with a spectroscopic redshift  $z = 3.19$ . It is also detected at  $850\mu\text{m}$ , as GN37 in the Pope et al. (2006) catalog, and at  $1.1\text{mm}$  (ID AzGN9, Perera et al. 2007).




FIG. B1.— A comparison of flux densities derived from GALFIT with those from the catalog used in Elbaz et al. (2011). The dotted line in each panel is the one-to-one relation, while the dashed lines represent the  $3\sigma$  flux limits of 5.7 mJy, 7.2 mJy and 9 mJy at  $250\mu\text{m}$ ,  $350\mu\text{m}$  and  $500\mu\text{m}$ , respectively. When a source is not detected in the catalog, a  $2\sigma$  upper limit is shown for clarification (red open squares).

Like GH500.31, the  $P$ -statistics for the IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  catalog revealed another candidate at  $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.3$ , but it is not detected in the radio. We chose the  $z = 3.19$  source detected in both  $24\mu\text{m}$  and radio as the candidate counterpart.

GH500.35: There are three  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources identified as candidate counterparts based on the  $P$ -statistics, but none of them has a radio or submm detection. They are estimated to have photometric redshifts of 2.4, 2.2, and 1.98, and may contribute equally to the SPIRE flux. Therefore, we are unable to obtain a unique and secure identification. However, by inspecting the radio image (Morrison et al. 2010), we find a tentative radio detection at the position of source at  $z = 2.4$ . As this source is closest to the peak of the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map, we consider it as the tentative counterpart of the  $500\mu\text{m}$  source. Using deeper VLA interferometry, or mm interferometric follow-up, it will be possible to further localize the  $500\mu\text{m}$  emission.

GH500.36: The source is near the edge of the GOODS-N region, and has a photometric redshift of  $z = 0.6$ . However, similar to GH500.7, the best-fit with a suite of CE01 library templates underestimates SPIRE 350 and  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux significantly. Although allowing the redshift to vary yields a better fit ( $\Delta\chi^2 > 10$ ) at a redshift of 2.6, it is possible that the source has an unusual IR SED, which is much colder than any CE01 templates.

## B. NOTES ON HERSCHEL FLUX MEASUREMENTS

The *Herschel* flux measurements for the  $z \gtrsim 2$   $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ -selected ULIRGs are mainly from the photometry catalog of Elbaz et al. (2011). However, as described in Section 4.1, around 30% of our sources (including three  $24\mu\text{m}$  dropouts) have no measured  $500\mu\text{m}$  fluxes in the catalog. For these objects, *Herschel*/SPIRE flux densities are derived from PSF-fitting with GALFIT (Peng et al. 2002), using  $24\mu\text{m}$  prior positions. We used a very similar source extraction and photometry method to the one described in Elbaz et al. (2011), but fitted a stamp image of size  $1.5 \times 1.5 \text{ arcmin}^2$  centered on the source of interest for each of SPIRE bands. In brief, our fittings were performed using an “iterative” approach. We fit simultaneously all  $24\mu\text{m}$  priors above the  $5\sigma$  limit within each of the 250, 350 and  $500\mu\text{m}$  stamps, but *those with derived Herschel fluxes much smaller than the associated flux errors were removed from the prior list*. The simultaneous fitting was then repeated using the refined list of  $24\mu\text{m}$  priors until no such low-signal-to-noise objects were left. Note that our restriction of the  $24\mu\text{m}$  priors to the  $5\sigma$  limit would bias against some fainter  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources, especially those at high redshift contributing to the SPIRE emission. We therefore visually checked the residual image to check for residuals at the positions of  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources which were excluded from the original input list. If these were found, those objects were added back into the prior list and the fit was re-iterated. The flux density for each object was then found from the best fit ( $\chi^2/d.o.f < 2$ ). To assess the reliability of our SPIRE photometry, we performed similar GALFIT fitting to all  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel*  $500\mu\text{m}$  sources identified in this paper and compared the results to the catalog of Elbaz et al. (2011), as shown Figure B1. Our measurements are in good agreement with the catalog used in Elbaz et al. (2011), except for high-redshift sources whose SPIRE photometry may be significantly under-estimated in the catalog due to their fluxes being assigned to neighbors with brighter  $24\mu\text{m}$  emission.

## C. MULTIWAVELENGTH IMAGES OF HIGH-REDSHIFT HERSCHEL SOURCES







FIG. C1.— Cutout images of *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m counterparts, from left to right: MIPS 24 $\mu$ m, *Herschel* 500 $\mu$ m, the  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$  map, and the VLA 1.4GHz. All images are 60 arcsec on a side and the black dashed circle indicates the search radius of 15''. The smaller white squares are secure counterparts, while the dashed squares represent tentative identifications (Table 1).

FIG. C1.— *continued*

## D. INFRARED-TO-RADIO SEDS OF HIGH-REDSHIFT HERSCHEL SOURCES

In Figure D1, we present the measured IR-to-radio photometry and best-fitting SED for each of the 500 $\mu$ m sources presented in Table 2. We find that the majority of our 500 $\mu$ m sources are well represented by the best-fit SED templates, and only seven ULIRGs display evidence of a radio excess above the best-fit SED.






FIG. D1.— Spectral energy distribution of our  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}/S_{24\mu\text{m}}$ -identified  $z \gtrsim 2$  *Herschel* sources (open circles). Dotted lines represent the best-fit SED template to the photometry. The modified blackbody emission which is used to fit the far-IR-to-submm data is shown by the red dashed line.



FIG. D1.— *continued*

FIG. D1.— *continued*




FIG. E1.— *Left*: Cumulative distribution of  $P$ -values for all counterparts within the search area for our cataloged sources. The solid line shows the distribution for  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts, while the dotted and dashed line is for the counterparts at the IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  and radio, respectively. *Right*: Comparison between the  $P$ -values calculated using the predicted  $S_{500\mu\text{m}}$  starting from the  $24\mu\text{m}$  flux and that starting from the stellar masses (Schreiber et al. 2015). Grey dashed line is the one to one relation.

#### E. COMPARISON BETWEEN MIPS AND IRAC IDENTIFICATIONS

In Figure E1 (left), we plot the cumulative distribution of modified  $P$ -values for all  $24\mu\text{m}$  sources within the search radius (solid line), and that for the IRAC  $3.6\mu\text{m}$  counterparts (dotted line). The latter were calculated using the main-sequence relation and a mass dependent dust extinction to predict the  $500\mu\text{m}$  flux from their stellar masses (see the text for details), in order to taking into account alternative counterparts for a few sources with no  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterpart satisfying  $P \lesssim 0.1$ . Using only the  $24\mu\text{m}$  image for counterpart identifications, we find 27 out of 36 sources detected in the ratio map having counterparts with  $P \lesssim 0.1$ . A  $P$ -value cut at 0.1 corresponds to only 30 per cent of the cumulative distribution of  $P$ -values for the  $24\mu\text{m}$  catalog, and 7 per cent for the IRAC catalog. In comparison to the distribution of the traditional  $P$ -values for the radio catalogue (dashed line), it demonstrates that our approach using  $24\mu\text{m}$  data can be useful for identifying secure  $500\mu\text{m}$  counterparts in the absence of the radio data, by effectively reducing the number of foreground sources falling into the search area by chance. Note that  $P$ -statistics for the IRAC catalog that has a high source surface density ( $79/\text{arcmin}^2$ ) is in agreement with the calculation starting with the  $24\mu\text{m}$  counterparts (Figure E1, right), albeit with a large scatter.

Several studies have shown that high-redshift submm-selected galaxies can be identified through their IR colors as measured by IRAC (e.g., Pope et al. 2006; Yun et al. 2008). By comparing with theoretical color tracks of dusty starbursts, Yun et al. (2008) proposed a dust-obscured young stellar population as the origin of the red IRAC color. In Figure E2, we show the 3.6- and  $5.8\mu\text{m}$  color-flux diagram for all IRAC sources within the search radius (grey dots), with secure counterparts identified with  $P$ -statistics highlighted in red circles (Table 2). It is apparent that candidate high- $z$   $500\mu\text{m}$  sources in the GOODS-North are typically redder than the field population. Within the region that was defined to select SMG counterparts (dotted line, Biggs et al. 2011), we recover 91 per cent of the catalogued sources in Table 2, further supporting the reliability of our counterpart identifications.






FIG. E2.— 3.6 and 5.8  $\mu\text{m}$  colour-flux diagram for IRAC sources falling into the search area. The secure radio and MIPS-identified counterparts are shown with red circles. The dotted line shows the region to select SMGs defined by Biggs et al. (2011).